

JESUS AS THE RIGHTEOUS SUFFERER IN THE BETRAYAL OF JUDAS:

UNDERSTANDING THE USE OF PSALM 41:10 IN JOHN 13:18

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES

GORDON CONWELL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

SOUTH HAMILTON, MASSACHUSETTS

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

MASTER OF THEOLOGY IN NEW TESTAMENT

BY

BENJAMIN N. BAE

APRIL 17, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Approach to the Study.....	1
1.2 Introduction to the New Testament Use of the Old Testament.....	3
1.3 Methodology of the Study.....	5
1.4 Outline of the Study.....	6
CHAPTER 2: UNDERSTANDING PSALM 41:10.....	8
2.1 Overview of Psalm 41.....	8
2.1.1 Davidic Authorship.....	8
2.1.2 Form and Structure of Psalm 41.....	11
2.1.3 Development of Thought in Psalm 41.....	12
2.2 Exegetical Analysis of Psalm 41:10.....	14
2.3 Psalm 41:10 in Early Judaism.....	19
2.3.1 1 QH ^a XIII, 25-26.....	21
2.4 Psalm 41 and Psalm 55 in Later Jewish Writings	23
2.4.1 m. Abot 6.3.....	25
2.4.2 b. Sanh 106b.....	26
2.4.3 Tg. 55, 14.....	27
CHAPTER 3: UNDERSTANDING PSALM 41:10 IN JOHN 13:18.....	29
3.1 Literary Context.....	29
3.2 Literary Unity of John 13:1-20.....	32
3.3 Comparative Analysis of the MT, LXX, and NT.....	36
3.4 Interpretations of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18.....	38
3.5 Interpretive and Theological Use of Psalm 41:10.....	43
3.5.1 “He Who Ate My Bread”	43
3.5.2 “Has Lifted His Heel Against Me”	54
3.6 Further Theological Implications from Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18.....	68
CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION.....	
4.1 Summary of Findings.....	82
4.2 Suggestions for Further Research.....	86
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	88
VITA.....	97

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
AOTC	Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries
ATDan	Acta Theologica Danica
BBR	Bulletin for Biblical Research
BDAG	Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000 (Danker-Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich)
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BHS	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentary
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
ETL	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
GKC	<i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> . Edited by Emil Kautzsch. Translated by Arther E. Cowley. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910
HALOT	<i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Ludwig Koehler, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann J. Stamm. Translated and edited under the supervision of Mervyn E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994-1999
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IVP	Intervarsity Press

<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTS	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
LNTS	The Library of New Testament Studies
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NCBC	New Cambridge Bible Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NT	New Testament
NTS	New Testament Studies
OT	Old Testament
<i>PRSt</i>	<i>Perspectives in Religious Studies</i>
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SCM	Student Christian Movement
TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries
<i>TDOT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by John T. Willis et al. 8 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974-2006
<i>TWOT</i>	<i>Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke. 2 vols. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980.

<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>

ABSTRACT

This study examines how the evangelist understood and used Psalm 41:10 in his own context in John 13:18. The evangelist's textual representation of Psalm 41:10 is noticeably different from the way the LXX translates Psalm 41:10. This observation calls to attention the primary task of this study: What is the rationale for the evangelist's unique textual representation of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18? The author of this study argues that the presence of this textual uniqueness in the Fourth Gospel is best explained through the assessment of the evangelist's hermeneutical and theological understanding of Psalm 41:10. For this assessment, the author evaluates the possible reasons for the evangelist's intentional employment of certain interpretive and exegetical techniques. Based on these observations, the author concludes that in the betrayal of Judas, the evangelist seeks to portray Jesus as a Davidic figure who fulfills the pattern of the righteous sufferer. This was hermeneutically, theologically, and thereby textually significant for the evangelist.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Completing this study would not have been possible without the support of my mentors, friends, and family. I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Eckhard Schnabel for guiding me along the journey of this study. I have much to learn from his deep knowledge in Scripture. I am grateful for Dr. Sean McDonough, Dr. Carol Kaminski, Dr. Roy Ciampa, Dr. Stephen Witmer, and Dr. Stephen Um for teaching me the beauty and joy of discovering Christ in all of Scripture. I am also grateful for Dr. Stephen Um and Dr. Benjamin Shin for their support and guidance not only in my academic endeavors but also in my growth in character and pastoral identity. Finally, I thank God for my family, for constantly believing in me even in times when I doubt God's ability to do great things in my weaknesses. I dedicate this study to my biggest cheerleader, my wife, Jeanie.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 APPROACH TO THE STUDY

There are several noteworthy approaches to consider when evaluating the meaning and place of Psalm 41:10¹ in John 13:18. Many scholars emphasize the importance of understanding the eastern Mediterranean background.² This approach brings to light the historical and contextual meaning of meal sharing: a symbolic act of exercising intimate covenantal bonds.³ A picture of intimacy is given in order to emphasize the absurdity of the betrayal. This highlights the illustrative function of the quotation. Others observe the quotation from the disciples' perspective and evaluate what the content of the quotation must have meant for the disciples and their future ministry.⁴ In this case, the quotation serves as a preview for future rejections, betrayals, and challenges that the disciples must also face in their work of ministry as they follow Jesus' footsteps. This approach underscores the didactic function of the quotation. Some also see the quotation functioning as a reminder for the disciples to be spiritually alert lest they too be tempted by Satan to betray their

¹ I follow the Hebrew numbering throughout this study. See Psalm 40:10 for the Septuagintal numbering and Psalm 41:9 for all English translations.

² See Ben Witherington, *John's Wisdom: a Commentary On the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 238; Bruce J. Malina and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary On the Gospel of John* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998), 224; Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: a Commentary* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003), 912-13; Andrew Lincoln, *The Gospel According to Saint John* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005), 373; Jo-Ann A. Brant, *John* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011), 203.

³ Keener, *John*, 913.

⁴ See J. Ramsey Michaels, "The Uses of Scripture in John 13:18-19," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (eds. Craig Evans and Richard Stegner; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 459-75.

loyalty to Jesus.⁵ Rudolf Bultmann states: “The intention is rather to destroy any false security of belief.”⁶ This also underscores the didactic function of the quotation. The most familiar approach is perhaps the evaluation of the prophetic nature of the quotation. This approach demonstrates the idea that the betrayal of Judas was not an unforeseen treacherous act but one that finds its proper place within God’s larger redemptive purposes centered on the person and work of Jesus Christ.⁷ In other words, Judas’ betrayal was in full accordance with Scripture. The quotation then functions apologetically: Judas’ betrayal and Jesus’ omniscience do not have to be contradictory or mutually exclusive.

As noted above, many scholars seek to address the meaning of the quotation and the possible reasons for its use. However, the specific question of how the quotation is understood, interpreted, and used by the evangelist is not an area that often receives much scholarly attention. This particular question focuses on the hermeneutical and theological interpretations of the quotation by the evangelist.

Within the discipline of the New Testament (NT) use of the Old Testament (OT), and in this case, the Fourth Gospel’s use of the OT, the question of interpretation and hermeneutics is highly significant. If Barnabas Lindars is correct

⁵ Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: a Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox Press, 1971 (1941)), 477-78.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ F.B. Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978 (1882)), 193; Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 552-53; Witherington, *John’s Wisdom*, 238; Francis Martin and William M. Wright, *The Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 237.

in suggesting that the OT serves as the most crucial influence on NT theology,⁸ and if Thomas Glasson is correct in stating that the evangelist “absorbed the whole of the Old Testament into his system”,⁹ then there must be much to be said and observed in the examination of the role of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18. The aim of this study is to conduct a detailed analysis of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18 to understand not only what the quotation means and why it is used the way it is used, but also how this quotation is interpreted and implemented textually, hermeneutically, and theologically in the Fourth Gospel by the evangelist.

1.2 INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

The discipline of the NT use of the OT has certainly gained a new wave of interest and attention in recent years. As a result, the emphasis on intertextuality¹⁰-- “the imbedding of fragments of an earlier text within a later one”¹¹-- has become an important contribution to NT study at large. However, some express concerns of possible abuse and misuse, suggesting that without clear boundaries and controlled methodologies, intertextuality can functionally end up being “a radical form of

⁸ Barnabas Lindars, “The Place of the Old Testament in the Formation of New Testament Theology: Prolegomena,” *NTS* 23 (1976-7): 60.

⁹ T.F. Glasson, *Moses in the Fourth Gospel*, SBT 40 (London: SCM, 1963), 36.

¹⁰ See G.K. Beale, *Handbook On the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012), 39-40 on the discussion of the terms, intertextuality and inner-biblical exegesis. Because the term intertextuality is used rather loosely, Beale prefers to use the term inner-biblical exegesis. Beale states that intertextuality in the realm of biblical studies is indeed a procedure of inner-biblical exegesis: understanding the relationship between the two testaments.

¹¹ Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 14.

modern reader-response”¹². Some of these concerns are reactionary to Richard Hays’ works. Hays is one of the notable NT scholars who argues for the need to understand the NT use of the OT primarily through the category of echoes.¹³ Hays’ main challenge against the common categories of the NT use of the OT (quotations, allusions, and echoes) is that by calling something a citation or quotation, the focus of the task is then no longer centered on the search for the “unstated or suppressed points of resonance”¹⁴ between the texts, but primarily on the issue of source criticism.¹⁵ Hays is not ignoring the importance of the source-critical approach; instead, he aims to shift the modern interpreters’ mindset regarding the understanding of the NT use of the OT. With a higher sensitivity for detecting echoes, even the subtle ones, Hays believes that his approach allows readers the proper liberty to accurately analyze the hermeneutics of the NT writers.¹⁶ While Hays’ commitment to Scripture and his dedication to uncover the meanings of various allusions and echoes are to be highly respected, there is a need for proper boundaries and controls. Richard Longenecker believes it is best “to start on the

¹² Paul Foster, “Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament,” *JSNT* 38 (2015): 109.

¹³ See Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 29-33 for seven tests for detecting echoes: availability, volume, recurrence, thematic coherence, historical plausibility, history of interpretation, satisfaction. Hays discusses the nature of these categories in his latest work also. See Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco: Baylor, 2016), 10.

¹⁴ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 20. Also see Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 11.

¹⁵ The discussion of sources is indeed important and will be examined thoroughly in chapter 3.

¹⁶ Also see Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos: the Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982 (1939)), 198: “In previous studies of the NT use of Scripture, far too much emphasis has been placed on actual quotations, and these have been considered apart from the other allusions to the OT. The NT use of Scripture is not restricted to the direct quotation of OT passages.”

surer footing of explicit quotations and to move into the allusive treatment of biblical themes and references only with great care.”¹⁷ For this reason, this study aims to start on the “surer footing”, that is the explicit quotation found in John 13:18, to carry out a comprehensive analysis on the interpretation and use of Psalm 41:10 by the evangelist. The goal is to adopt the heart of the Haysian method,¹⁸ to have the eyes to see and be open to various points of resonance between the texts, while being fully aware of the boundaries that provide helpful measures for guarding against various interpretive suggestions that may be more creative than biblical.

1.3 METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

This study will cover elements of all four foci of the NT use of the OT discipline proposed by David Allen: *context, interpretive technique, textual form, and macro-versus-micro*.¹⁹ *Context* will be discussed in the assessment of the meaning of Psalm 41:10 in its own OT context. This evaluation is helpful for determining how much the evangelist understood and incorporated the contextual meaning of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18. *Interpretive technique* will be highlighted in

¹⁷ Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), xvii.

¹⁸ The spirit of the Haysian method is neatly captured in the concept, “figural interpretation”, presented by Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), 73: “Figural interpretation establishes a connection between two events or persons in such a way that the first signifies not only itself but also the second, while the second involves or fulfills the first. The two poles of a figure are separated in time, but both, being real events or persons, are within temporality. They are both contained in the flowing stream which is historical life, and only the comprehension, the *intellectus spiritualis*, of their interdependence is a spiritual act.” I consider the nature of this study as an exercise of this spiritual act.

¹⁹ David M. Allen, “Introduction: The Study of the Use of the Old Testament in the New,” *JSNT* 38 (2015): 3-16.

the assessment of the interpretive and exegetical tools the evangelist used to demonstrate his understanding of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18. *Textual form* will be thoroughly discussed for the purpose of assessing how Psalm 41:10 is textually represented in various places (MT, LXX, NT). The detected textual differences will inform the very need for this study: What is the best explanation to account for the unique textual representation of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18? *Macro-versus-micro* will also be highlighted as the study seeks to understand how certain textual details of the quotation (micro) might expose the larger theological connections (macro) that are operative for the evangelist. To accomplish these goals, the following outline will be implemented and followed.

1.4 OUTLINE OF THE STUDY

First, I will conduct a comprehensive analysis of Psalm 41:10 in its own right (chapter 2). In this chapter, the goal is to assess the authorial intent and meaning of Psalm 41 and to trace the use of Psalm 41:10 in early and later Jewish texts. The following chapter (chapter 3) will seek to carry out the main goal of this study: to assess how the evangelist understood and used Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18. I will first examine the literary context of John 13:18, then thoroughly analyze the unique textual representation of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18. Based on these findings, I will address the larger theological connections and motifs that may be operative for the evangelist. The last chapter (chapter 4) provides the final summary as well as some

helpful and relevant questions that are certainly worth exploring but are beyond the goals of this particular study.

CHAPTER 2: UNDERSTANDING PSALM 41:10

INTRODUCTION

Before evaluating the use of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18, I will assess how Psalm 41:10 is understood in its own OT context. This chapter begins with an overview of Psalm 41 to provide ample context to assess the meaning and placement of Psalm 41:10 in its own chapter. Verse 10 in particular will receive a thorough exegetical analysis. Following this assessment, the Second Temple Jewish context will be evaluated for the purpose of assessing how Psalm 41:10 was understood and used in places other than the Fourth Gospel in early Judaism. The works of later Jewish exegetes will also be evaluated. These findings and observations will directly be applied to the next chapter as the study moves forward to conduct a comprehensive analysis on the use of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18.

2.1 OVERVIEW OF PSALM 41

2.1.1 DAVIDIC AUTHORSHIP

While the traditional approach affirms the historical reliability of Davidic authorship of the Psalter, modern critical scholarship has greatly challenged this notion. One of challenges is seen in the assessment of the Davidic titles. The Davidic titles, which are the headings of seventy-three psalms in the Psalter, have traditionally been regarded as reliable indicators of authorship.²⁰ This is no longer

²⁰ Tremper Longman and Raymond B. Dillard, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006), 243: “It is of course impossible to prove that each and every psalm

the scholarly consensus.²¹ Much of this critical view is influenced by the rise of interest in form criticism and the understanding of liturgical uses of the Psalter throughout the history of Israel worship. Through the lens of modern critical scholarship, it is less likely to attribute David as the author of the psalms that are designated to him.

However, there are still compelling reasons to consider the validity of the traditional approach. How David is described throughout the OT (1 Sam 16:17-23, 18:10; 2 Sam 1:17-27, 3:33, 23:1-7; Am 6:5) cannot be ignored in the discussion of authorship and Davidic titles.²² David is frequently portrayed as a king who highly values music. Tremper Longman notes: “It is inconceivable, considering the strength of the biblical tradition surrounding David’s interest in and involvement with music in worship, that David did not write any of the psalms.”²³ Peter Craigie agrees with this sentiment as well. Even though he believes that “majority of psalms are anonymous and that no certain statement can be made concerning their authorship...

attributed to David was written by him. But at the same time it is inconceivable, considering the strength of the biblical tradition surrounding David’s interest in and involvement with music in worship, that David did not write any of the psalms.”

²¹ Hermann Gunkel, *Psalms: a Form-Critical Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967), vi-viii and Sigmund Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 177 argue that the discussion of authorship and background must be viewed in light of the use of the Psalter throughout Israel’s history. They stress the importance of liturgical forms and cultic acts of Israel to establish *Sitz im Leben* of each psalm. Gunkel and Mowinckel are both skeptical of the idea that Davidic titles are set in place to indicate authorship. To be more specific, Mowinckel argues that Davidic titles are more for indicating the use of certain psalms for future Davidic kings.

²² Scholars often discuss the translation value of the preposition, ל, attached in front of the name, David, found in the titles. Translation options for לִדָּוִד are: 1) of David – indication of authorship, 2) for the use of David – indication of functionality for future Davidic kings, 3) belonging to David – indication of place in the collection of hymns dedicated to David. Scholars who support the traditional approach for Davidic authorship turn to the likelihood of the preposition’s role as an indicator of authorship and the portrayal of David elsewhere in Scripture to support their case. See Longman and Dillard, *Old Testament*, 232-33.

²³ Longman and Dillard, *Introduction*, 243.

nevertheless, the strong possibility remains that in some cases the Psalter contains psalms composed by David.”²⁴

Another approach to authorship that is particularly significant for this study is the evaluation of a widely accepted notion of authorship of the Psalter during the Second Temple Jewish period.²⁵ This approach focuses on the framework of common Jewish beliefs leading up to and during the days of the NT period. The primary question that rises from this approach is: To whom did the Jews attribute the authorship of the Psalter? In other words, how did the Jews leading up to and during the time of Jesus understand the authorship of the Psalter?²⁶ Margaret Daly-Denton comments: “Unlike modern critical scholarship, early Christian exegesis followed its contemporary Judaism in attributing the psalms to David, just as the Pentateuch was attributed to Moses, Lamentations to Jeremiah, and the Wisdom literature to Solomon.”²⁷ While the modern critical scholarship primarily focuses on the historical reliability of Davidic authorship, the approach to understand the Second Temple Jewish context reveals the theological implications of the assumed Davidic authorship.

I assume the validity of Davidic authorship for Psalm 41 for the following reasons: 1) the presence of a Davidic title, 2) the portrayal of David in other places in

²⁴ Peter C. Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 2nd ed. (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2005), 35.

²⁵ Much of modern critical scholarship does acknowledge the importance of understanding what the Jews in the Second Temple period assumed about the authorship of the Psalter. This by itself, however, does not ultimately and sufficiently answer the primary question of historical reliability of authorship for the modern critical scholars.

²⁶ See further discussion on this matter in 2.2 Exegetical Analysis of Psalm 41:10.

²⁷ Margaret Daly-Denton, *David in the Fourth Gospel: the Johannine Reception of the Psalms* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 5.

Scripture, and 3) the common understanding of David as the author of Psalm 41 in early and later Jewish writings. The argument made throughout this and next chapter largely focuses on the theological importance and weight of Davidic authorship. The Jews at the time did assume Davidic authorship of the Psalter and this was theologically significant for them.²⁸

2.1.2 FORM AND STRUCTURE OF PSALM 41

Many scholars acknowledge the difficulty of determining the genre or form of this particular psalm. There are elements of thanksgiving, lament, and illness all captured in this psalm and there are differing opinions on which theme is considered to be the most dominant. While I am inclined to deem this psalm as a lament psalm,²⁹ the task of identifying the genre does not present itself to be too profitable. For this specific case, the communicated meaning of the psalm can be clearly drawn out from the content of the psalm regardless of its supposed form. Much of this discussion is also dependent on how the psalm is to be structured, read, and interpreted.

There are several helpful ways to understand the structure of Psalm 41.

Hans-Joachim Kraus suggests: 1) Instruction, 2) Prayer, and 3) Thanksgiving.³⁰

Richard Clifford suggests: 1) Beatitude originating in the psalmist's experience, 2)

²⁸ See *ibid.*, 5-8. Hermeneutical and theological implications of Davidic authorship will be significant for the rest of this study.

²⁹ I follow A.A. Anderson, *Psalms* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 321.

³⁰ Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 1-59: a Commentary* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), 430.

The complaint and petition uttered at the time of affliction, 3) Report of the rescue.³¹

Walter Brueggemann and William Bellinger suggest: 1) The conclusion of the ground of rescue, 2) Complaint, 3) The conclusion of being a pleasure to God.³²

Most scholars are in agreement that there are three major movements within this particular psalm.³³

2.1.3 DEVELOPMENT OF THOUGHT IN PSALM 41³⁴

First section (vv. 2-4) is hortative and didactic in its approach. The psalm begins with the same opening word that was mentioned in Psalm 1, אָשֵׁר, creating a bookend effect. Psalm 41 (the closing psalm of Book 1), like Psalm 1 (the opening psalm of Book 1), begins with a description of someone who is considered blessed. In Psalm 41, blessed is the one who cares for the weak. The psalmist may be suggesting that because he cares for the weak, he is confident that he will be delivered out of his illness. In this case, the psalmist is portrayed as an exemplary figure who cares deeply for the weak. Another way to understand this section is to see the psalmist as the weak, asking others to care for him for they will be blessed.

³¹ Richard J. Clifford, *Psalms 1-72* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2002), 209.

³² Walter Brueggemann and William H. Bellinger Jr, *Psalms* (New York: Cambridge University, 2014), 201.

³³ Some scholars consider Psalm 41:14 to be on its own category because of its doxological content. This is also why the verse is understood to be a later edition that created the bookend effect for Book 1 of the Psalter. See Tremper Longman, *Psalms* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2014), 190-1. Also see Clifford, *Psalms 1-72*, 208-9: "Psalm 41:13 is the concluding benediction of the first book of the Psalter, not the final line of the psalm."

³⁴ Again, I follow the Hebrew numbering for how the verses are marked.

The following section (vv. 5-11) reveals the very reason for this particular psalm to be written - to express lament. An *inclusio* can be observed in the opening and the ending of this section as the psalmist pleads, “be gracious to me (חַנּוּנִי)”, in verses 5 and 11.³⁵ The content of this section contains the psalmist’s worries and troubles that cause him to be ill. These worries stem from voices and rumors that surround him to bring down his reputation (vv. 6-8). He describes what his enemies are like and what tactics are used against him (v. 9). The descriptions of pain become more detailed and intensified verse by verse until the climax of the psalmist’s pain in verse 10 - the experience of betrayal from a trusted friend. This is also the moment when the psalmist asks God to intervene (v.11).

The last section (vv. 12-14) concludes the psalm on a positive note by capturing the psalmist’s hope for an answered prayer. It is this surprising expression of confidence in God’s deliverance that causes most scholars to believe that this final section, especially the last verse, is a later edition to the original composition of the psalm. It is also this very reason that some scholars suggest this psalm to be a thanksgiving psalm, assuming that the psalmist was only able to write this psalm from a privileged position of being able to reflect back on past pains. Despite having all the various ways of understanding each section of this psalm, the central idea of the psalmist’s expression of his anguish due to his unwanted surroundings is clearly captured in the second section, especially in verse 10.

³⁵ Anderson, *Psalms*, 325. Also see Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 321: “It is framed by prayer (vv. 5 and 11) to God who is the only possible source of help.”

2.2 EXEGETICAL ANALYSIS OF PSALM 41:10

The verse begins with the phrase, גם־איש שלומי (even the man of my peace). The adverb, גם, is fronted at the beginning of the verse and is likely used emphatically to highlight the magnitude of the unjust pain that the psalmist experiences from his enemies.³⁶ In addition to all the surrounding troubles, he even experiences adversity from someone whom he once considered to be an intimate friend. Leading up to verse 10, the statements made about the enemies of the psalmist are primarily about what they do to hurt and attack the psalmist (vv. 6-9). Verse 10 marks the climax of the psalmist's lament as he describes the experience of betrayal from his intimate friend.

Who is this intimate friend? The mentioning of this intimate friend (a man of my peace) is followed by two descriptive phrases: אשר־בטחתי בו (in whom I trusted), אוכל לחמי (who ate my bread). The first relative clause explains how this intimate friend was worthy of the psalmist's trust and the second participial phrase illustrates how much trust was in this friendship. He trusted his friend enough to offer his bread. The two descriptions are functioning appositionally to give further details on the identification of the friend, highlighting the intimacy of the friendship.

The participial phrase אוכל לחמי is a descriptive phrase that needs to be understood in light of its ancient Near East background. Many scholars note that in the ancient Near East context, meal sharing indicates intimacy between two people or parties. Mitchell Dahood considers this as a “part of the covenant rite”, thereby

³⁶ GKC §154a; IBHS §39.3.4d.

emphasizing the nature of intimacy even more.³⁷ He argues that this type of bond that the psalmist is describing must have been covenantal (cf. Gen 31:54; Num 17:17-19; Ps 7:5).³⁸ If the purpose of this participial phrase is to further highlight the intimacy between the psalmist and his friend in whom he trusted, it is certainly reasonable to consider the presence of this covenantal nuance.

With the identification of the intimate friend (גַּם־אִישׁ שְׁלוֹמִי), followed by two further explanatory descriptions of who he is (אֲשֶׁר־בִּטְחָת בּוֹ אוֹכַל לַחֲמִי), the psalmist then uses an idiomatic phrase to describe the nature of the betrayal: הַגְדִּיל עָלַי עֶקֶב (has made his heel great against me). In other words, a statement of “who he is” is followed by a statement of “what he did”. What is clear and what most scholars agree on is the content of this idiomatic phrase - the idea of betrayal. What is unclear and where most scholars disagree on is the exact function of this specific idiomatic phrase in communicating that message of betrayal.³⁹

Many scholars provide their own translations based on their interpretations of the idiom’s function. Dahood translates: “spun slanderous tales about me”.⁴⁰ Charles Briggs translates: “has spoken great things against me”.⁴¹ Franz Delitzsch

³⁷ Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms I, 1-50* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1966), 251.

³⁸ Ibid. Also see Charles Briggs, *The Book of Psalms* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1906), 363 who translates this phrase, “the one in covenant with me”, agreeing with Dahood. But Briggs also states: “not to be interpreted as an individual, Ahithophel or any other, but as nations in covenant, who have treacherously broken covenant and become bitter enemies.”

³⁹ Clifford, *Psalms*, 212: “Though the exact meaning of the idiom is unknown, it no doubt means to betray, perhaps by agreeing with the judgment of the enemies.”; Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 321: “though the idiom is rare, the sense is clear enough.”

⁴⁰ Dahood, *Psalms I*, 249.

⁴¹ Briggs, *Psalms*, 361.

translates: “giving a great kick”.⁴² Kraus translates: “shows off against me”.⁴³ Rolf Jacobson translates: “has turned his back on me”.⁴⁴ Dahood and Briggs seek to translate the idiom to accurately reflect the context of what is happening to the psalmist described in verses 5-9. Delitzsch attempts to be as literal as possible while considering the communicated meaning of the idiomatic phrase. Kraus and Jacobson translate in a way to generally capture the idea of standing up against someone and facing or walking the other way. Even though the overarching message of betrayal and deceitfulness is clearly depicted, there are different ways of understanding the meaning of this idiomatic phrase.

There are two important words to highlight in this specific phrase: הגדיל and עקב. The verb גדל primarily communicates the idea of greatness. Specifically in the hiphil stem, which is the case for Psalm 41:10, the verb underscores the idea of magnifying, making something great, or becoming great.⁴⁵ This understanding is reflected in almost all the translation values suggested by the scholars mentioned above. If this is the case, then what does it mean to make great, grow, or magnify the heel (עקב)? What is the significance of the heel?

The noun, עקב, which is translated “heel” in the context of Psalm 41, has several other meanings in other biblical contexts. Possible definitions for עקב

⁴² C. F. Keil and Franz Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament - Psalms* (Downers Grove: Hendrickson, 2006 (1861)), 305.

⁴³ Kraus, *Psalms 1-59*, 429.

⁴⁴ Nancy L. deClausse-Walford, Rolf A. Jacobson, and Beth LaNeel Tanner, *The Book of Psalms* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 386.

⁴⁵ See Elmer B. Smick, “גדל,” *TWOT* 1:1315; Freiburg R. Mosis, “גדל,” *TDOT* 2:390-416; *HALOT* 1:179

include: the physical feature of a man (Job 18:9), horses' hoofs (Gen 49:17), exposed buttocks (Jer 13:22), a motion of taking steps (Ps 56:6), among others.⁴⁶ Given the metaphorical use in mind, Allen Ross demonstrates how עקב in Psalm 41 reflects the developed meaning of עקב in the larger context of Scripture.⁴⁷ Ross points to the story of Jacob as an important piece in this development. Jacob came out of his mother's womb grabbing the heel of his twin brother, Esau. He then went on to deceive his own brother (Gen 27:35-36),⁴⁸ and his uncle, Laban (Gen 30:29-31:12). It is hardly coincidental that a) Jacob's name derives from the word עקב, b) his birth narrative contains the literal sense of the word, c) Esau accuses him for cheating him out of his blessing using the metaphorical use of the word, and d) his portrayed character in Genesis is one that accurately fits the category of deceiver. Ross notes the specific connotation of the word, עקב, as it is demonstrated in Jacob's history, is carried on throughout Israel's history. The clearest evidence of this particular nuance of the word is seen in Jeremiah 9:4: כָּל־אִחַי עֲקֹבִי יַעֲקֹב (for every brother is a deceiver). The meaning of עקב in light of Genesis and Israelite history may be effective in Psalm 41:10 as well. The verb גדל in its hiphil stem is then most likely emphasizing the magnitude of this deceit.

At this point, it is imperative to ask the following questions: Does the identification of the author of this psalm matter interpretively? If so, could there be a

⁴⁶ See J. Barton Payne, "עקב," *TWOT* 2:1677; *HALOT* 2:872-73.

⁴⁷ Allen Ross, *A Commentary On the Psalms: 1-41* (Kregel Exegetical Library; Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic & Professional, 2012), 873-95.

⁴⁸ Interestingly enough, ESV translates וַיַּעֲקֹבֵנִי in Gen 27:36 as "he has cheated me".

specific historical incident or experience that propelled the psalmist to write this psalm? What are the possible implications if the psalmist and his intimate friend are identifiable? Briggs argues that Psalm 41 is to be interpreted nationally, meaning the occurrence of betrayal is not to be understood in the context of two individuals but two nations.⁴⁹ However, Delitzsch notes: “Psalm 41 and 55 lose every look of being alien to the history of David and his times.”⁵⁰ To follow Delitzsch, the historical backdrop of David and Absalom must be in view.

In 2 Sam 15-17, the narrative of Absalom’s conspiracy begins, where Absalom seeks to dethrone the kingdom of his own father, David. Absalom knew that the momentum was on his side. His ability to lure in Ahithophel, David’s counselor, boosted his confidence even more (15:12). Ahithophel’s credential as a counselor is summed up in the following verse: “Now in those days the counsel that Ahithophel gave was as if one consulted the word of God” (16:23). It was crucial for Absalom to gain and David to lose Ahithophel. David received the news that his own counselor turned his back on him (15:31). As the narrative unfolds, Ahithophel experiences an ironic twist. Although Ahithophel’s contribution was great for Absalom’s success, Ahithophel himself received abandonment from Absalom and realized that his counsel was no longer effective or needed. Ahithophel ultimately heard what was to him a death sentence: “The counsel of Hushai the Archite is better than the counsel

⁴⁹ Briggs, *Psalms*, 363.

⁵⁰ Keil and Delitzsch, *Psalms*, 305.

of Ahithophel” (17:14). Hearing this from Absalom and the men of Israel, Ahithophel ended his own life.

With this Davidic background in mind, Psalm 41:10 may be interpreted as the expression of David’s agony at the hearing of Ahithophel’s betrayal. The intimate friendship, described as a relationship that was marked by meal sharing, is also fitting given Ahithophel’s role of a counselor who stood by David to give the word of God (2 Sam 16:23). If this Davidic background is to be assumed, then the relationship between Psalm 41 and 55 is worth noting as well. Given the similarity of descriptions of this intimate friend mentioned in Psalm 41 and 55, it can be argued that David is expressing his lament over a painful experience of betrayal in both of these psalms. Ahithophel is his intimate friend (Psalm 41), his equal, and companion (Psalm 55). Are there enough compelling reasons to consider the validity of this interpretive assumption? For this, I now turn to the evaluation of the Second Temple Jewish texts as well as the later Jewish writings. The following two sections are dedicated to this evaluation.

2.3 PSALM 41:10 IN EARLY JUDAISM⁵¹

George Brooke, like Daly-Denton, defends the theological and hermeneutical weight of Davidic authorship but from a slightly different perspective. He argues for the idea of historicization of Davidic psalms in Second Temple Jewish texts,

⁵¹ For an overview of the discussion regarding the importance of assessing the Second Temple Jewish texts for NT study, see Richard Bauckham, *The Jewish World Around the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2010), 207-20.

particularly in the Dead Sea Scrolls. He argues that certain timeless poems were seen in light of Davidic events, “thus providing for a reading of the psalm as if it referred to a historical event.”⁵² The idea of historicization of Davidic psalms was growing and developing in the Second Temple Jewish period. One example of this can be seen in the ways that Qumran community often applied the context of David prophetically to its own life experiences.⁵³ A similar idea behind this phenomenon is also captured in the increased number of Davidic titles in the LXX. In comparison to the Hebrew text, there are fourteen additional psalms in the LXX that have the superscription, “A Psalm by David” or “A Song by David”.⁵⁴ This may suggest that there was an inclination to dedicate more psalms to be associated with David’s biography. This would also suggest that the issue of Davidic authorship is not merely historical but also highly theological. Brooke notes: “The historicizing tendency that is discernible now in the additional superscriptions of the psalms in Hebrew manuscripts from Qumran and in the role of David has long been recognized as a characteristic of the development of the LXX psalter; this LXX tendency now has a wider frame of reference.”⁵⁵ Brooke evaluates what is evident in the LXX within its larger cultural context. The phenomenon of historicization of

⁵² George J. Brooke, “The Psalms in Early Jewish Literature in light of the Dead Sea scrolls,” in *The Psalms in the New Testament* (eds. Steve Moyise and Maarten J.J. Menken; London; New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 15.

⁵³ Brooke provides 11 QPs^a as an example. 4 Maccabees 18 is another example. During the reign of the infamous Syrian king, Antiochus IV Epiphanes, a mother speaks to her children about their deceased father using the words of David in the Psalter: “He used to sing to you the psalmist David who says: Many are the afflictions of the righteous” (4 Macc 18:15). The reference to Ps 34:20 is clearly evident in this text.

⁵⁴ Pss 32, 42, 70, 90-98, 103, 136, 151. For more information on the superscription for David, see A. Pietersma, “David in the Greek Psalms,” *VT* 30 (1980): 213-26.

⁵⁵ Brooke, “Early Jewish Literature,” 23-24.

Davidic psalms is not an isolated incident found in the LXX but a reflection of a wider cultural framework. The following is an example of a Second Temple Jewish text that demonstrates one's tendency to understand certain psalms in light of David's life and David's life in light of one's own.⁵⁶

2.3.1 1 QH^a XIII, 25-26

The clearest use of Psalm 41:10 in the Second Temple Jewish literature is found in 1 QH^a XIII, 25-26.⁵⁷ 1 QH^a, the *Hodayot*, the Thanksgiving Hymns, is widely considered to be sectarian.⁵⁸ Some scholars suggest that Teacher of Righteousness, who is often attributed as a God-sent leader by several texts in the Dead Sea Scrolls,⁵⁹ must have been the leader of this particular community.⁶⁰ Some

⁵⁶ Maarten J.J. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form* (Kampen: Peeters, 1996), 133.

⁵⁷ Numbering system is not consistent throughout scholarship. I follow the numbering system according to Carol Newsom, Hartmut Stegemann, and Eileen Schuller, *Qumran Cave 1. III* (DJD XL; Oxford: Clarendon, 2008). Note that certain commentaries still use Sukenik's numbering system (in this case: V, 23-24).

⁵⁸ As André Dupont-Sommer, *Le Livre des Hymnes découvert près de la mer Morte (1QH)* (Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1957), 9-10 indicates, a number of distinctive characteristics of sectarianism are found: emphasis on predestination, election, dualism, specific revelation, and others.

⁵⁹ See CD 1:9-11

⁶⁰ See explanation given by Nicholas J. Zola, "The One Who Eats My Bread Has Lifted His Heel against Me: Psalm 41:10 in 1QH^a 13.25-26 and John 13:18" *PRSt* 37 (2010): 410: "Largely based on the situational agreements between what the Qumran pesharim reveal concerning the Teacher and what the author of the Teacher Hymns reveals about himself, such as that the Teacher was taught divine secrets by God, that he faced conflict in his community, that he was persecuted by the Wicked Priest, and that he now lives in exiles." See Gert Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtheit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 168-77; Carol A. Newsom, "Kenneth Burke Meets the Teacher of Righteousness: Rhetorical Strategies in the *Hodayot* and the *Serek Hayahd*," in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins* (eds. Harold W. Attridge, John J. Collins, and Thomas H. Tobin; Lanham: University Press of America, 1990), 121-30.

are not convinced by this argument.⁶¹ Nevertheless, the community leader, through the *Hodayot*, reveals rich scriptural quotations and allusions to explain and describe his own life experiences.⁶² This particular experience of the leader happens to be about betrayal and he quotes Psalm 41:10 to explain his own situation and context. The textual connections and similarities are notably seen between Psalm 41:10 and

Psalm 41:10	1 QH ^a XIII, 25-26
גם־איש שלומי אשר־בטחתי בו אוכל לחמי הגדיל עלי עקב	ג[ם א]וכלי להמי עלי הגדילו עקב ויליזו עלי
Even the man of my peace whom I trusted in, who ate my bread, has made his heel great against me.	Ev[en those who e]at my bread have raised their heel against me ⁶³

1 QH^a XIII, 25-26 (see chart above). Considering the common realities of the Qumranites, where they often understood their context to be the setting for all eschatological realities of Scripture, the community leader in this case may be applying the meaning of Psalm 41:10 to be ultimately fulfilled in his own context. In other words, for the community leader, his own setting is the fulfillment of what was prophetically uttered by David.⁶⁴ The assumption here is that the Qumranites generally understood David to be the composer of the psalter. The Psalms Scroll (11QPs^a) does explicitly mention David and attribute him as the composer of many

⁶¹ See Svend Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*, Acta Theologica Danica 2 (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960), 328; Phillip R. Callaway, *The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation* (JSPSup 3; Sheffield: JSOT, 1988), 185-97.

⁶² See Zola, "The One Who Eats My Bread", 412.

⁶³ Translation by Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 173.

⁶⁴ This phenomenon is found elsewhere in the Second Temple Jewish works as well. David's suffering in Ps 34:20 is appropriated in 4 Maccabees 18:15.

psalms and songs: “All these [psalms and songs] he [David] spoke through (the spirit of) prophecy which had been given to him from before the Most High” (11QPs^a 27.11).⁶⁵

One clear difference between 1 QH^a XIII, 25-26 and Psalm 41:10 is the reference to the betrayer(s). David in Psalm 41:10 describes his unique experience of betrayal from a particular individual (singular reference to “the man of my peace”) while the community leader in 1 QH^a XIII, 25-26 describes his own experience of betrayal by many (plural reference to “all those who eat”).⁶⁶ Contexts for these two figures are notably different but that did not deter the leader of the community to find the commonality in the two events and appropriate the experience of David onto his own. Hence, the noted textual discrepancies between the two texts are not the results of inaccurate or loose translation; rather, they are the results of the leader’s own interpretation and understanding of the content for his own context.

2.4 PSALM 41 AND PSALM 55 IN LATER JEWISH WRITINGS⁶⁷

The problem with assessing texts from later Jewish exegetes for NT study is that there is a chronological error. Texts from later generations of Rabbinic Judaism were written much later than the NT. Raymond Brown believes that the “appeal to

⁶⁵ Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1179.

⁶⁶ The textual evidence of 1 QH^a XIII, 25-26 is most likely a result of free paraphrasing. See Menken, *Old Testament*, 124.

⁶⁷ Many scholars note the relevance of these later Jewish writings in their assessment of Ps 41:10 in John 13:18. See T.F. Glasson, “Davidic Links with the Betrayal of Jesus,” *ExpTim* 85 (1973-74), n. 1; Schuchard, *Scripture*, n. 35; Menken, *Old Testament*, 133; Daly-Denton, *David*, 194-95. Some of the later Jewish texts that are not mentioned in this section are: *Num. Rab.* 18.17 and *Midr. Teh.* Ps 55.

later Jewish midrashim is methodologically weak.”⁶⁸ For example, it is methodologically weak to propose that certain NT quotations from the psalter were influenced by an unidentified written form of the Targum to the Psalms.⁶⁹ Anthony York acknowledges this methodological limitation: “Given the assumption that the New Testament and the Targumim were contemporaneous, one still has to establish that the text of the Targum we have today corresponds to the text of New Testament times, and this is no easy task.”⁷⁰ However, concluding that there is no relevance or any hermeneutical value in assessing the content of these later Jewish texts is also problematic because interpretations, especially if they are widely acknowledged and commonly accepted, do not develop overnight. In this way, there are values in understanding how certain Jewish exegetes in Rabbinic Judaism developed their thoughts based on early traditions of the first century. For this reason, the argument that is being presented here and expanded in the next chapter is that the interpretations of later Jewish exegetes may reflect and confirm what the first century Jews, including the evangelist, assumed. If Second Temple Jewish texts can *reveal* the cultural milieu of the evangelist, later Jewish writings may *affirm* the cultural milieu of the evangelist.⁷¹ The following texts are evaluated to establish a few key common

⁶⁸ Raymond Brown, *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave* (London: Chapman, 1994), 1447.

⁶⁹ Anthony D. York, “The Dating of Targumic Literature,” *JSJ* 5 (1974): 49-62.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* 62.

⁷¹ While I do not necessarily agree with all the conclusions Daly-Denton makes from her assessment of later Jewish texts, and I am not interested in examining how much of Targum and Midrash interpretations is characteristic of the norms of first century, I generally follow Daly-Denton’s methodology and approach in Daly-Denton, *David*, 19: “We will use the Jewish sources with caution, in full awareness of the problem of depending on material which found written form long after NT

denominators found in the interpretation of Psalm 41 and Psalm 55 in later Jewish writings: Davidic authorship and Ahithophelian association.

2.4.1 m. Abot 6.3

Psalm 41:10 is not directly quoted in m. Abot 6.3 but certain hermeneutical assumptions about Psalm 55 are clearly noted. The assumption of Davidic authorship and the identification of the familiar friend in Psalm 55 as Ahithophel are directly relevant to the interpretation of Psalm 41:10. The language found in Psalm 55 is very similar to Psalm 41. In Psalm 55:14, David describes Ahithophel as: “a man my equal, my companion and my familiar friend”. In Psalm 41, David describes Ahithophel as “my close friend in whom I trusted”. Alexander Kirkpatrick states: “If David was the author of the Psalm, the false friend can hardly be other than Ahitophel.”⁷²

The context of m. Abot 6.3 is the discussion regarding the treatment of others with honor through the guidance of Torah: “He who learns from his fellow one single section, or one single rule, or one single verse, or one single expression, or even one single letter, is under obligation to treat him with honour”.⁷³ Following this statement, the relationship between David and Ahithophel is mentioned as an

times. We will therefore attach more credibility to material that is supported by the witness of other NT writings and such independent sources as Philo, Josephus and the Apostolic Fathers.”

⁷² Alexander F. Kirkpatrick, *Psalm I-XLI* (Cambridge: University Press, 1901), 216.

⁷³ Translation by J. Israelstam, *Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud: Aboth*, ed. Isidore Epstein (London: Soncino, 1988), 131.

example: “For so we find with David, king of Israel, who learnt from Ahithophel...”⁷⁴

The exact language of Psalm 55:14 is then applied to David and Ahithophel to describe the nature of their relationship: “Called him his master, his companion and his familiar friend, as it is said, but it was thou, a man mine equal, my companion and my familiar friend.”⁷⁵ This description provides a small glimpse into the assumed norm of the background for Psalm 55:14.

2.4.2 b. Sanh 106b

Sanhedrin was an institution that designated “the higher courts of law which in the latter part of the period of the Second Temple administered justice in Palestine according to the Mosaic law in the more serious criminal and especially capital cases.”⁷⁶ In the Talmud, and in this case, tractate Sanhedrin, certain debates and conversations of those in this institution are found. In b. Sanh 106b, a discourse between Rabbis Issac, Ammi, Mesharsheya, and Johanan are introduced. Questions regarding Doeg the Edomite, the chief herdsman to Saul, are first mentioned and discussed. Following these questions, Ahithophel is brought into the conversation. R. Johanan first clarifies the distinction between Doeg and Ahithophel: “Doeg and Ahithophel did not see each other, Doeg living in Saul’s reign, Ahithophel in David’s.”⁷⁷ Then he discusses the parallel relationship between the two: “Doeg and

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ H. Freedman, *Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud: Sanhedrin*, ed. Isidore Epstein (London: Soncino, 1969), xi.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 29.

Ahithophel did not live out half their days. It has been taught likewise: Bloody and deceitful men shall not live out half their days. Doeg's entire lifetime amounted only to thirty-four years and Ahithophel's to thirty three."⁷⁸ The communicated message in this parallel account is clear: Ahithophel, like Doeg, also wronged his own king. R. Johanan continues on to describe the relationship between David and Ahithophel prior to Ahithophel's betrayal. He then quotes portions of Psalm 55 to explain how David once regarded Ahithophel as his teacher, companion, and disciple. This particular finding is helpful for understanding the rabbinic interpretations of Davidic psalms, and in this case, Psalm 55. Ahithophel was considered a significant figure for understanding the nature of betrayal and its consequences.

2.4.3 Tg. 55, 14

In Targum, the assumption of Ahithophel as David's close companion is also present: "But it is you, Ahithophel, a man like me, a teacher who instructed me and one who made me to know wisdom. We used to hold harmonious counsel together; in the house of the sanctuary of God we walked briskly."⁷⁹ Later on in this chapter, Ahithophel and Doeg are mentioned together as those who are deserving of death. This also confirms the content that was discussed in b. Sanh 106b.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ David M. Stec, *The Targum of Psalms: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes*, ArBib 16 (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2004) 14-16. Unless otherwise noted, Targum translations are from this print.

SUMMARY

Psalm 41 is the final psalm in Book 1. It comprises of the following three movements: instruction, prayer, and thanksgiving. The verse of our interest, verse 10, belongs to the second section of the psalm where the psalmist expresses his agony. The source of agony comes from the psalmist's experience of constant pressure from his enemies. The climax of his pain is depicted in verse 10, where he describes the experience of a heartbreaking betrayal. This betrayal is from an intimate friend (אִישׁ שְׁלוֹמִי) and the psalmist uses an idiomatic phrase, "has made his heel great against me (הִגְדִּיל עָלַי עֶקֶב)", to describe the nature of this betrayal. Various translation options for this specific idiomatic phrase attest to the difficulty of understanding the exact meaning of the idiom but the idea of betrayal as the ultimate sense of the meaning is undoubtedly clear. Texts from the Second Temple Jewish period seem to suggest that David is the author of this psalm. Later Jewish exegetes also echo this idea. Based on this assumption of Davidic authorship, Ahithophel is identified as the intimate friend who betrays David. Psalm 41 and 55 are perceived to be the psalms that reflect David's pain during this time and certain textual similarities in these two psalms point to this understanding. The role of Davidic authorship and Ahithophelian association will be particularly important as the study now focuses on the task of understanding the evangelist's interpretation and use of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18. Does the evangelist also assume the story of David and Ahithophel as the backdrop of this psalm? Does this prove to be hermeneutically and theologically significant for the evangelist?

CHAPTER 3: UNDERSTANDING PSALM 41:10 IN JOHN 13:18

INTRODUCTION

The goal of this chapter is to evaluate how Psalm 41:10 is handled textually, interpretively, and theologically in John 13:18. To begin, we will assess the place and role of John 13:18 in its broader and immediate literary contexts. We will then argue for the literary unity of the footwashing narrative (John 13:1-20), which includes our verse of interest. This argument leads to the issue of authorship - whether or not the entire footwashing narrative can be attributed to the evangelist as the sole author. Based on the result of this assessment, we can properly evaluate and investigate the unique textual use of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18. This unique use is easily identifiable when comparing the textual representations of Psalm 41:10 in various places (MT, LXX, NT). Based on these observations, the main focus of this study will be presented: The textual uniqueness found in the quotation of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18 is best understood and explained through the evaluation of the evangelist's interpretive and theological use of Psalm 41:10.

3.1 LITERARY CONTEXT

Scholars often note that there is a noticeable difference in the way that the OT quotations are used in the first half of the Fourth Gospel, the Book of Signs (chapters 1-12), and in the second half of the Fourth Gospel, the Book of Glory

(chapters 13-20).⁸⁰ In the Book of Signs, most of the quotations are introduced with the common expression, “it is written (καθώς ἐστὶν γεγραμμένον)”. These OT quotations “are always associated with a moment of revelation to ‘the Jews’ that take place during Jesus’ public ministry.”⁸¹ These moments of revelation disclose how “Jesus is Lord, temple, living bread, Son of God, and king.”⁸² However, in the Book of Glory, “the evangelist consistently seeks to emphasize the fulfillment of Scripture with regard to Jesus’ passion and the obduracy motif associated with it.”⁸³ Most of the OT quotations in the Book of Glory are introduced with the common expression, “in order that Scripture might be fulfilled (ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ)”. The fulfillment theme intensifies as more quotations are revealed in the Book of Glory. The difference in the wording of these introductory formulas in the Book of Signs and the Book of Glory can be explained through the evaluation of the evangelist’s larger theological goal: to present the latter half of Jesus’ ministry, which includes rejection, betrayal, and suffering, also as fulfillments of Scripture.⁸⁴ Andreas Köstenberger notes: “The overall purpose of the use of the OT in John’s Gospel, as evidenced by

⁸⁰ See Alexander Faure, “Die alttestamentlichen Zitate im 4. Evangelium und die Quellenscheidungshypothese,” *ZNW* 21 (1922): 99-121.

⁸¹ Francis J. Moloney, “The Gospel of John: The ‘End’ of Scripture,” *Int* 63 (2009): 358.

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ Andreas J. Köstenberger, “John,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (eds. D.A. Carson and G. K. Beale; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 417.

⁸⁴ See Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 286: “All these events are interpreted, with the aid of the scriptural citations, as the consummation of a divine design that is fully enacted in Jesus’ death... This apologetic motivation also explains why the fulfillment quotations in the Fourth Gospel are clustered toward the end of the story rather than, as in Matthew, at the beginning.”

formal quotations, is to show that both Jesus' public ministry and his cross-death fulfilled scriptural patterns and prophecies."⁸⁵

John 13:18, the focused text of this study, is located within the footwashing narrative (13:1-20). This narrative is found in the beginning portion of the Book of Glory and it functions as a preamble to the farewell discourse (13:31-16:33). This suggests that the cleansing of the community,⁸⁶ symbolized in the act of footwashing, is a necessary step for the farewell discourse to take place.⁸⁷ John 13:18 is situated in the context of this pivotal moment.⁸⁸ Jesus begins to form the identity of the new messianic community centered on himself first through the cleansing (footwashing) then through the final reminders (farewell discourse).

In John 13:1-11, Jesus first reveals that the sign of footwashing is given to preview his eventual death. In 13:12-20, he suggests that footwashing is an example to be followed by the disciples. Jesus adds that this ceremony is certainly not for all who are there with him as Judas would eventually betray him and the rest of the disciples. Psalm 41:10 is then quoted in John 13:18 as a way to show how Judas' betrayal fulfills what was prophetically said in Psalm 41:10. This would indicate that even a treacherous act as this one is not outside of God's sovereignty and his plan for

⁸⁵ Köstenberger, "John," 416-17.

⁸⁶ Some scholars (Cullmann, Loisy, Bauer, Von Campenhausen, Barrett, Brown) do acknowledge that footwashing represents the sacramental act of baptism. The cleansing that I am referring to is not reflective of this view. Meaning of cleansing should be understood in light of John's Christology and soteriology. Understanding footwashing primarily through the sacramental framework seems far fetched. See Dongsu Kim, *An Exegesis of Apostasy Embedded in John's Narratives of Peter and Judas Against the Synoptic Parallels* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 2004), 175 for more detailed reasons against the sacramental view.

⁸⁷ Köstenberger, "John," 486.

⁸⁸ See Kim, *Exegesis of Apostasy*, 176. Arguing for the literary unity of John 13:1-30, Kim suggests that "Judas' departure is the climax to the episode of footwashing."

mankind's redemption. This, as verse 19 indicates, is so "that when the denials, betrayals, and the death of Jesus have been perpetrated, the disciples will remember what Jesus said and come to believe in him as ἐγὼ εἶμι." ⁸⁹ In other words, the eventual betrayal that finds its rightful place in the realm of scriptural fulfillments ultimately displays Jesus' divinity. ⁹⁰ This ironic claim of divinity is clearly demonstrated in the rest of the Fourth Gospel: Jesus dies the death of a criminal on the cross. Yet, "even here Jesus will manifest his divine identity for those who have eyes to see (cf. 8:28). Not only does he demonstrate his foreknowledge; he also alerts the disciples that his death on a cross does not obscure God's glory but reveals that glory." ⁹¹

3.2 LITERARY UNITY OF JOHN 13:1-20

The discussion of literary unity of John 13:1-20 is crucial for determining whether or not there is one coherent development of thought by a single author.

⁸⁹ Margaret Daly-Denton, *David in the Fourth Gospel: the Johannine Reception of the Psalms* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 191. Also see Francis J. Moloney, "A Sacramental Reading of John 13:1-38," CBQ 53 (1991) 237-56.

⁹⁰ For a detailed analysis of ἐγὼ εἶμι as an indicator of Jesus' divinity in John 13:19, see David Mark Ball, *'I Am' in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background, and Theological Implications* (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1996), 198-201. Isa. 43:9-10 is seen to be the OT background for verse 19 as well. See Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John* (2 vols; Peabody: Baker, 2010), 1:914: "Jesus' wording in several passages suggests an allusion to the promises of God in the biblical prophets: he foretold the future so that they might recognize his identity as YHWH (Isa 43:9-10)." Also see Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies On the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 39-40, 46-50; Richard Bauckham, *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 243-50.

⁹¹ Marianne Meye Thompson, *John: a Commentary*, New Testament Library (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2015), 292. See Urban C. von Wahlde, *The Gospel and Letters of John, Volume 2: the Gospel of John*, The Eerdmans Critical Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 598-99.

There have been several notable studies dedicated to this particular passage and questions regarding historical reliability, significance, sources, and theological implications have all been raised and discussed in great detail.⁹²

The consensus among scholars is that there are two distinct interpretations given by Jesus regarding footwashing. After having washed the feet of his disciples,⁹³ Jesus first discusses the significance of footwashing with Peter (vv. 6-11), focusing on his eventual death.⁹⁴ Then, he discusses the matter with the rest of his disciples (vv. 12-20), focusing on the exemplary aspect of footwashing. Some suggest that there must be two different sources or authors for these two different interpretations.⁹⁵ Richard Bauckham responds to this argument with the following: “Both are Christological, taking their meaning from the fact that it is Jesus the Lord who serves as a slave, but the first is Christological and soteriological, the second

⁹² See J. A. T. Robinson, “The Significance of Footwashing,” in *Neotestamentica et Patristica* (ed. O. Cullmann; Leiden: Brill, 1962), 144-45; James D. G. Dunn, “The Washing of the Disciples’ Feet in John 13:1-20,” *ZNW* 61 (1970): 247-252; John Painter, “The Farewell Discourses and the History of Johannine Christianity,” *NTS* 27 (1981): 525-43; Maurits Sabbe, “The Footwashing in Jn 13 and Its Relation to the Synoptic Gospels,” *ETL* 58 (1982): 279-308; F.F. Segovia, “John 13:1-20. The Footwashing in the Johannine Tradition,” *ZNW* 73 (1982): 31-51; John Christopher Thomas, *Footwashing in John 13 and the Johannine Community*, JSNTS 61 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991); M. Coloe, “Welcome into the household of God: the footwashing in John 13,” *CBQ* 66 (2004): 400-415.

⁹³ See Bauckham, *Testimony*, 192 for detailed information regarding the practice of footwashing in antiquity. Bauckham highlights the social structural effects of the Johannine footwashing account. Footwashing was never expected to be done by the superior to the inferior.

⁹⁴ R. Alan Culpepper, “The Johannine *hypodeigma*: A Reading of John 13,” *Semeia* 53 (1991): 139.

⁹⁵ Raymond Edward Brown, *The Gospel According to John XIII-XXI* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1970), 560 summarizes Bultmann and Boismard’s positions on the nature of these two interpretations. Both Bultmann and Boismard present their critical approaches. Bultmann argues that some parts of the passage were added later on by the evangelist, while Boismard argues that two different accounts were conflated together. The underlying assumption in both of these positions is that a single author could not have written this passage in its entirety. Bauckham directly addresses this issue by stating that the two distinct and yet complementary interpretations are indeed written by the evangelist.

Christological and exemplary.”⁹⁶ Bauckham defends the unity of the passage and thereby the case for the single author, the evangelist, and points out the flaws in the purely speculative nature of the critical perspective: “That the fourth evangelist should highlight both aspects in relation to the footwashing is not at all surprising, and needs no theories of sources and redaction to explain it.”⁹⁷ In other words, there is no need for another critical theory to account for two seemingly different interpretations that are fully capable of being complementary.⁹⁸ D. A. Carson also argues for the literary unity of this pericope based on stylistic and linguistic consistency: “Certainly at the level of language, John has so forcefully stamped his account with his own style, idiom and emphases that source-criticism at that level is vain.”⁹⁹ Craig Blomberg contributes to this discussion as well: “We already have in the synoptic tradition another example of the blending of the soteriological and paraenetic value of Christ’ death, Mark 10:42-45. There is no reason why the two elements should not always have been held together in John 13:1-20.”¹⁰⁰ Blomberg turns to the Synoptic Gospels to present the case that what the evangelist does in the Fourth Gospel with footwashing is not entirely unique.

The evidence seems to suggest that the literary unity of John 13:1-20 is reliable and therefore should be maintained. The critical view of seeing two different

⁹⁶ Bauckham, *Testimony*, 194.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 197.

⁹⁸ See Bruce G. Schuchard, *Scripture Within Scripture: the Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1992), 110-11; Menken, *Old Testament*, 126-27.

⁹⁹ D.A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (Leicester: Eerdmans, 1991), 460.

¹⁰⁰ Craig L. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel: Issues and Commentary* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2011), 191.

sources or authors behind two different interpretations is as pointed out, merely speculative. The two different interpretations can adequately and sufficiently be understood as two different emphases that Jesus communicates from a singular idea. Maryanne Thompson concludes: “Jesus leaves his disciples a legacy that begins with his love for them and issues in their mutual love.”¹⁰¹ What does the literary unity of the footwashing narrative mean for John 13:18 in particular? This means that it is safe to assume the evangelist as the sole author of the entire footwashing narrative, which includes the verse of our particular interest. With confidence, we can assess how the evangelist understood and used Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18. Commenting from Sabbe’s detailed analysis, Maarten Menken confirms this idea by pointing out some of the words or phrases found in John 13:18 that are very much characteristic of the evangelist: “λέγειν, περὶ, οἶδα, elliptical ἀλλ’ ἵνα, γραφή in the singular, ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ.”¹⁰² Overall, the argument for considering the evangelist as the sole author of the entire footwashing narrative, which includes the quotation of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18, is defensible at the logical, literary, textual, and stylistic level. With this in mind, we now turn to John 13:18, and see how Psalm 41:10 is textually used and understood by the evangelist.

¹⁰¹ Thompson, *John*, 280.

¹⁰² Menken, *Old Testament*, 127.

3.3 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE MT, LXX, AND NT

Psalm 41:10 (MT)	Psalm 40:10 (LXX) ¹⁰³	John 13:18
גם־איש שלומי אשר־בטחתי בו אוכל לחמי הגדיל עלי עקב	καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς εἰρήνης μου, ἐφ’ ὃν ἤλπισα, ὁ ἐσθίων ἄρτους μου, ἐμεγάλυνεν ἐπ’ ἐμέ πτερνισμόν.	Οὐ περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν λέγω· ἐγὼ οἶδα τίνες ἐξελεξάμην· ἀλλ’ ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ· ὁ τρώγων μου τὸν ἄρτον ἐπήρεν ἐπ’ ἐμέ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ.
Psalm 41:10 (MT)	Psalm 40:10 (LXX) ¹⁰⁴	John 13:18
Even the man of my peace whom I trusted in, who ate my bread, has made his heel great against me.	Indeed, the person at peace with me, in whom I hoped, he who would eat of my bread, magnified trickery against me.	I am not speaking concerning all of you. I know the ones I have chosen; but in order that the scripture may be fulfilled, “He who ate my bread has lifted up his heel against me.”

There are several notable observations¹⁰⁵ to be made from this textual comparison.¹⁰⁶ 1) The participle τρώγων is used in the Fourth Gospel where ἐσθίων is used in the LXX. This is the first prominent textual difference between the Fourth Gospel and the LXX when it comes to this quotation. While the communicated

¹⁰³ While there are various ways to determine what is exactly meant by the LXX (earliest Greek translation, Origen’s Koine, Origen’s fifth column, any authoritative Greek text, and the entirety of the Greek tradition), the understanding of the LXX for this study is best captured in Daly-Denton, *David*, 14: “The term ‘LXX’ refers to our present best possibility of access to the Greek text which Johannine Christian knew.” Greek text for the LXX throughout this study is from Alfred Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.

¹⁰⁴ Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 567. Unless otherwise noted, LXX translations are from this translation.

¹⁰⁵ The following observations will outline the discussion in the section 3.5 Interpretive and Theological Use of Psalm 41:10.

¹⁰⁶ The first four observations according to Schuchard are typically used for the argument of a different Hebrew *Vorlage* and the final two observations are typically used for the argument of free translation or free memory. See Schuchard, *Scripture*, 108-9.

meaning of “eating” is still equally represented in both words, the reality of this textual difference itself rightly raises questions about sources. 2) The Fourth Gospel contains the noun ἄρτον in the singular but the LXX contains the same noun in the plural: ἄρτους. The textual difference found here is not as drastic as the difference noted in the participle mentioned above, but the same question regarding sources is warranted. 3) In the Fourth Gospel, the pronoun μου comes before the noun, ἄρτον, but in the LXX, the same pronoun comes after the noun, ἄρτους. The difference is noted in the placement of the pronoun. The question still remains as to why there is a difference at all. 4) The Fourth Gospel translates הגדיל as ἐπήρην but the LXX maintains the literal meaning of הגדיל in ἐμεγάλυνεν. Maintaining the literal translation as it is seen in the LXX requires fewer explanations. If this is the case, then what is the rationale for the textual evidence found in the Fourth Gospel? How did the evangelist arrive at his textual decision? 5) The third person possessive pronoun αὐτοῦ is found in the Fourth Gospel but not in the LXX. 6) The Fourth Gospel translates כַּף as πτέρναν but the LXX translates it as πτερνισμόν. The Fourth Gospel in this case translates the Hebrew noun literally while the LXX does not. 7) The first half of Psalm 41:10 (“even the man of my peace whom I trusted in”) is not quoted in John 13:18. This observation can be easily explained if the evangelist simply did not consider the first half of the verse to be relevant or necessary; however, if there is a specific reason for not including this portion in the quotation, then this observation of absence deserves more attention.

Psalm 41:10 found in the Fourth Gospel seems to be closer to the textual evidence of the Hebrew version than the LXX.¹⁰⁷ The presence of a singular noun for bread, ἄρτον, and the literal and accurate translation of עֶקֶב as πτέρναν in the Fourth Gospel are some of the examples to support this case. This still poses the following valid and tough questions: Why is there so much textual complexity when Psalm 41:10 is clearly seen as a quotation in John 13:18? Why do the LXX and the Fourth Gospel differ so much textually? How valid is the argument of a different Hebrew *Vorlage* in this case? Defective memory? Free translation? There are several proposals that seek to provide the most adequate and comprehensive explanations for all the textual difficulties mentioned above. The following section will present a brief overview of the explanations given by scholars who have greatly contributed to this topic and discussion.

3.4 INTERPRETATIONS OF PSALM 41:10 IN JOHN 13:18

This survey is not an attempt to trace the history of meaning of John 13:18; rather, the attempt here is to trace the development of theories given by scholars who have made meaningful attempts at explaining the textual complexities found in

¹⁰⁷ Scholars like Westcott, Lagrange, Schlatter, Bernard, Barrett, Schnackenburg, Brown, Witherington, Hanson, Menken and many others observe this. Menken, *Old Testament*, 125 notes: “Scholars generally agree on the Hebrew text being the source of John’s quotation, at least a more probable source than the LXX.” While there are many things that Menken and Schuchard agree on, this certainly is not one. Schuchard makes his case clear that there is no reason to reject the LXX as the only textual tradition for the evangelist. Schuchard, *Scripture*, xvii notes: “Indeed, there is in John’s citations tangible evidence for the use of one and only one textual tradition, the OG.” Schuchard prefers to use the term OG to refer to the “first Greek translation of the Bible” and LXX for “the entire collection of Jewish-Greek Scripture.” I will continue to use the term LXX for the sake of consistency and clarity. The discussion between Menken and Schuchard regarding the role of the LXX will be discussed in detail in the section, 3.5 Interpretive and Theological Use of Psalm 41:10.

the quotation of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18.¹⁰⁸ This particular question is one that is subsumed under the larger question regarding the Fourth Gospel's use of the OT: What is the best explanation for the OT quotations in the Fourth Gospel that seem to disagree sharply with any known source material?¹⁰⁹

NT study in modern scholarship has been largely dealing with the issue of historicity and this has greatly impacted the way many scholars have approached the understanding of the Fourth Gospel's use of the OT. Respected Johannine interpreters like Alexander Faure, Günter Reim, Edwin Freed, and Maarten Menken have all contributed to this area of interest with a historical-critical approach that focuses on the task of understanding the sources. Faure observes that explicit citations found in the Fourth Gospel provide a window for seeing the pre-Gospel sources. For example, for Faure, the difference in the ways that citation formulas are used in the Book of Signs (often, "it is written") and the Book of Glory (often, "in order that Scripture may be fulfilled")¹¹⁰ indicates that there must have been multiple sources.¹¹¹ Scholars like Freed, Reim, and Menken take a slightly different approach as they aim to evaluate the question of sources case by case. All three scholars attempt to provide explanations that take into consideration the various degrees of

¹⁰⁸ For succinct summaries of the timeline of these scholars and their contributions, see Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, *The Prophetic Gospel: a Study of John and the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 234-253; Ruth Sheridan, *Retelling Scripture* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 12-22; Alicia D. Myers and Bruce G. Schuchard, *Abiding Words: the Use of Scripture in the Gospel of John* (Resources for Biblical Study; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 1-8.

¹⁰⁹ See Schuchard, *Scripture Within Scripture*, xiii. This particular question is also just "one aspect of the overall utilization of the Old Testament in John's Gospel."

¹¹⁰ See section 3.1 Literary Context.

¹¹¹ Faure, "Die alttestamentlichen," 101-2.

uses of the LXX, MT, certain targumic traditions, DSS, early Christian traditions, and others.¹¹² Freed acknowledges that it is nearly impossible to determine the exact source-text for the evangelist and suggests that the OT quotations in the Fourth Gospel could be a product of a Johannine school, a like-minded group of Christians who came together under the influence of the evangelist.¹¹³ Reim argues that the evangelist most likely relied heavily on early Christian sources, not the MT or the LXX.¹¹⁴ Commenting particularly on Reim's approach, Anthony Hanson notes: "When we consider how many allusions, echoes, and implicit references to scripture we have detected in the Gospel, this is a totally unacceptable conclusion."¹¹⁵ Hanson argues that most of the explanations jump too quickly into the realm of unknown sources without fully taking into consideration the way Scripture reveals itself all throughout the Fourth Gospel. Menken's particular contribution to this discussion is worth noting at this point.

Menken argues that the most compelling explanation for the textual complexities of the OT quotations in the Fourth Gospel can be found in the assessment of the evangelist's editorial activities. Regarding the specific case of John 13:18, Menken notes: "The quotation can be adequately explained by assuming Johannine redaction of a known version of the OT text, using recognized exegetical

¹¹² Edwin D. Freed, *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John* (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 127-30; Günter Reim, *Studien Zum Alttestamentlichen Hintergrund Des Johannesevangeliums* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 188-90; Menken, *Old Testament*, 205-6.

¹¹³ Freed, *Old Testament Quotations*, 129-30.

¹¹⁴ Reim, *Studien*, 189.

¹¹⁵ Hanson, *Prophetic Gospel*, 251.

techniques.”¹¹⁶ For Menken, the textual complexities are not the results of different unknown sources, mishandling of certain known sources, or even faulty memory; they are from the evangelist’s editorial activities that may be theologically and christologically driven.¹¹⁷ In this way, Menken intentionally shifts some of the attention away from the realm of sources. While the questions of sources are certainly important, Menken’s contribution allows the right emphasis on the evaluation of editorial activities to properly answer the questions of sources. Menken states: “It was in all probability... that the deviations from the Hebrew text can be accounted for by the use of an exegetical technique current in the cultural milieu of the Fourth Gospel.”¹¹⁸ Agreeing with Menken, Bruce Schuchard also notes the value of assessing the intentionality behind the evangelist’s editorial activities. He points to the evangelist’s “conscious application of established exegetical techniques”¹¹⁹ and how it often reflects his theological emphases.

Given this survey of scholarship, some of the notable hypotheses on the matter of textual uniqueness found in John 13:18 are the following: a) Hebrew *Vorlage*,¹²⁰ b) presentation of improved and nuanced Greek,¹²¹ c) free adaptation or

¹¹⁶ Menken, *Old Testament*, 125. This has a slightly different nuance than the explanation of “free translation”. See below.

¹¹⁷ Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John* (Grand Rapids: Crossroad, 1990), 3:26 suggests that certain edits are there as improvements for the Greek reader. He also suggests that the evangelist does make small textual adaptations for his particular theological purposes.

¹¹⁸ Menken, *Old Testament*, 125.

¹¹⁹ Schuchard, *Scripture*, xv.

¹²⁰ J. de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 66-67.

¹²¹ Schnackenburg, *John*, 3:26; C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1976), 36-37.

faulty memory,¹²² d) different author other than the evangelist,¹²³ e) the evangelist's understanding of the text based on an earlier Christian tradition,¹²⁴ or f) various influences of the LXX.¹²⁵ While all of these hypotheses may provide certain strengths in their own ways, the evidence seems to strongly support and favor the case made by Menken and Schuchard.¹²⁶ The goal of the following section is to thoroughly assess how these two scholars, along with a few others, focus on evaluating the reasons and methods for the evangelist's editorial activities seen in the quotation of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18. While Menken and Schuchard are both in complete agreement that evaluating functions and interpretive techniques is critical for understanding the idea of forms and sources, the two scholars do find themselves disagreeing with one another on certain textual issues.¹²⁷ I will dedicate much of the following section to highlight the strengths of their agreed arguments and to provide helpful ways to navigate through some their disagreements as well. Based on this analysis, some noteworthy theological implications will be explored.

¹²² Freed, *OT Quotations*, 92.

¹²³ M. Wilcox, "The Composition of John 13:21-30," in *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black* (eds. E. E. Elis and M. Wilcox; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1969), 145-46.

¹²⁴ Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: the Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM-Canterbury, 1973), 98 explains that the text of the quotation found in John 13:18 is "a peshet text already established in the apologetics."

¹²⁵ C. H. Toy, *Quotations in the New Testament* (New York: Scribner's, 1884), 89.

¹²⁶ Menken and Schuchard certainly stand on the shoulders of many scholars in the past. For the purpose of this particular study, the focus will be on their particular contributions to this discussion as they represent two of the more recent and authoritative contributions on understanding the evangelist's use of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18.

¹²⁷ See Menken, *Old Testament*, 14; Schuchard, *Scripture*, xv. Schuchard mentions that he was not aware of Menken's work during the beginning stage of his research. Menken in his introduction also acknowledges Schuchard's work.

3.5 INTERPRETIVE AND THEOLOGICAL USE OF PSALM 41:10

The question of “how” certain textual decisions are made has much to do with the evangelist’s use of various interpretive techniques, while the question of “why” certain textual decisions are made considers the evangelist’s larger theological goals or purposes. The following sections focus on addressing both of these questions to accurately assess the interpretive and theological use of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18. Answers for these questions will then rightly point to the proper meaning of the quotation. The following two sections together form the entire quotation¹²⁸ and each critical textual matter¹²⁹ will be discussed in detail.

3.5.1 “HE WHO ATE MY BREAD”

1) The word τρώγων is used in the Fourth Gospel where ἐσθίω¹³⁰ is used in the LXX. While some may present the argument of a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, a closer look at the way τρώγω is used in the Fourth Gospel may provide a more convincing case for explaining the textual discrepancy between the Fourth Gospel and the LXX. Chapter 13 is not the only place where τρώγω appears in the Fourth Gospel. In chapter 6, where the bread of life discourse takes place, τρώγω appears multiple times (6:54, 56, 57, 58). A comprehensive analysis of τρώγω in the Fourth

¹²⁸ This specific format is taken from Menken, *Old Testament*, 123-38.

¹²⁹ These textual matters were discussed in a previous section of this chapter. See section 3.3 Comparative Analysis of the MT, LXX and NT.

¹³⁰ Psalm 41:10 seems to be implicitly operative for Mark 14:18 also. In Mark 14:18, the verb ἐσθίω is used. Brown, *John XIII-XXI*, 571 states: “Mark’s implicit citation echoes the LXX form of the psalm; John’s explicit citation is closer to MT than to LXX... John’s use of the psalm is independent of Mark’s.”

Gospel is worth discussing here since the implications may directly impact the way $\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\gamma\omega$ should be understood in 13:18.¹³¹

Leading up to the bread of life discourse in 6:25-58 where $\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\gamma\omega$ appears several times, the story of Jesus feeding the five thousand is mentioned in 6:1-15. This is hardly a coincidence since the bread that is offered to many through the miraculous work of Jesus serves as a hint, or a preview, to the very person of Jesus, the true bread of life himself.¹³² This idea is further highlighted through the mentioning of the manna in the wilderness (v. 31), where Jesus claims that he is the bread of heaven that gives life to the world (v. 33). The evangelist is developing the narrative step by step to ultimately highlight Jesus as the true bread of life where eternal life is found (v. 35). It is in this context that the phrase, “eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood” is mentioned (v. 35). The language of eating ($\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\gamma\omega$) and drinking found in this verse can be interpreted in various ways.

An argument is made that the use of $\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\gamma\omega$ in chapter 6 is eucharistic for several reasons: a) the clearest reading of the language used in 6:53-57, eating and drinking of flesh and blood, would naturally lead to eucharistic senses, and b) the

¹³¹ Schnackenburg, *John*, 3:26 disagrees. Again, he believes that the evangelist’s editorial activities are reflective of the textual improvements for the Greek reader. Schnackenburg states: “It is therefore difficult to conclude from this evidence that there is any special connection between this verse and 6:53-58.” For Schnackenburg, there is no need to see the connection between John 6 and 13 since the textual uniqueness of John 13:18 can be adequately explained by the evangelist’s efforts to make textual changes to provide improved Greek.

¹³² See Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 322: “the manna story is not just about a past event in salvation history; rather, it points forward *figurally* to a different kind of bread altogether... John is once again teaching his readers how to reread Israel’s Scripture; by reading backwards, Jesus reinterprets the manna story as prefiguring *himself*.”

very word τρώγω, as opposed to ἐσθίω, carries eucharistic overtones.¹³³ While several scholars are strong proponents of this idea,¹³⁴ the argument is not too compelling. Again, this is an important context to consider since scholars often connect the use of τρώγω in chapter 6 to the use of the same word in chapter 13. In other words, understanding whether or not there is a eucharistic background in chapter 6 may have a direct impact on how 13:18 is to be interpreted. The following are some of the reasons to consider rejecting the eucharistic backdrop for 6:53-57.

For the evangelist, the word τρώγω simply functions as the present tense suppletive for the aorist φάγομαι.¹³⁵ In 6:53-54, σάρκα and αἷμα are the direct objects of both φάγητε (v. 53) and τρώγων (v. 54). This evidence favors the understanding that the evangelist uses the two words, φάγητε and τρώγων, interchangeably. Where ἐσθίω is expected to be read as the present tense of φάγομαι, the evangelist uses τρώγω instead. Based on this observation, Menken indicates that scholars often overlook the idea that τρώγειν in 6:54-58 “is simply an equivalent of ἐσθίειν.”¹³⁶ He argues that the interchangeability of the two words by the evangelist should lessen

¹³³ Based on “τρώγω,” *BDAG*, 829, Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John: Text and Context* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 186 notes: “a word which indicates the action of a physical crunching with the teeth, renders concrete the notion of the eating of the flesh of Jesus.” In this case, the argument is a linguistic one.

¹³⁴ See Bultmann, *John*, 235; Peter Borgen, *Bread from Heaven: an Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo* (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 93; Raymond E. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple* (New York: Paulist, 1979), 78f; Moloney, *John*, 186. Bultmann sees this passage to be deeply impregnated with eucharistic overtones: “those who participate in the sacramental meal bear within them the power that guarantees their resurrection.” Bultmann sees the necessity of attributing authorship of this pericope to a later ecclesiastical editor. Moloney sees that “there can be no doubt that behind these words of Jesus lies a Christian community which celebrated the Eucharist.”

¹³⁵ See John 4:31, 32, 33; 6:5, 23, 26, 31, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 58; 18:28.

¹³⁶ Menken, *Old Testament*, 136.

the need for scholars to assume the presence of eucharistic tones in places wherever *τρώγω* is mentioned. As for the relationship between *τρώγω* in chapters 6 and 13, Köstenberger provides a helpful summary statement: “It is sufficient to understand the evangelist’s choice of word as establishing a back reference to the feeding of the multitude without invoking the Eucharist.”¹³⁷ J. Ramsey Michaels underscores the anachronistic nature of the argument for the eucharistic backdrop: “The Jews are confused by Jesus’ reference to ‘eating’ him, and their confusion is hardly to be allayed by referring to a Christian ritual that did not yet exist.”¹³⁸

A more helpful way to understand the meaning and use of *τρώγω* in 6:53-57 can be found in its immediate literary context. A parallel statement of 6:54 (“whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood”) can be seen in 6:40 (“everyone who looks to the Son and believes in him”). These verses describe the qualification for one’s inheriting of eternal life and being raised at the last day. This observation allows the understanding that the phrase, “eating his flesh and drinking his blood” (v. 54) is a metaphorical statement that carries the meaning of looking to the Son and believing in him (v. 40).¹³⁹ Schuchard notes: “In John 6, to eat the true bread which is Jesus himself means to believe in Jesus.”¹⁴⁰ The theme of belief must be highly considered all throughout chapter 6. Bauckham reaches a similar conclusion: “It is clear from

¹³⁷ Köstenberger, “John”, 487.

¹³⁸ J. Ramsey Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 396-97; Moloney, *John*, 186, notes: “the reader has not been instructed on Eucharist, but knowledge of it is presupposed in 6:11-13.” As already mentioned, Bultmann, *John*, 235 simply addresses this issue of anachronism by conveniently suggesting that there must have been a later ecclesiastical editor.

¹³⁹ See Carson, *John*, 296-98.

¹⁴⁰ Schuchard, *Scripture*, 113.

the context in John 6 (cf. v. 57: “eats me”) that the flesh and blood are Jesus himself, considered as crucified as well as incarnate. The transition in verse 51c is not from faith to the Eucharist as means of eternal life, but from believing in Jesus to believing in Jesus as the one who died a violent death for the life of the world.”¹⁴¹ Bauckham does acknowledge that it is possible for an audience in a particular historical period to be reminded of the Eucharist when encountering the language of bread and blood in chapter 6. This possibility, however, does not warrant the Eucharist to be considered as the primary background for chapter 6.¹⁴²

Therefore, it is safe to conclude that a) 6:53-57 does not consider the Eucharist as the backdrop and b) the use of the word *τρῶγω* is not unusual for the evangelist. The evangelist is familiar with the word *τρῶγω* and is using it in multiple places in the Fourth Gospel. The appearance of *τρῶγω* in 13:18 can be adequately explained by the understanding of the evangelist’s stylistic preference as well as his attempt to underscore a certain thematic connection within the Fourth Gospel. In other words, the use of *τρῶγω* can simply be explained by the fact that it is the preferred word of the evangelist and also that it is the key word that allows the evangelist to make a theological point. The connections between chapters 6 and 13 are then both textual and thematic. These two dynamics are interrelated, which means that certain textual similarities are detectable because certain thematic connections are operative.

¹⁴¹ Richard Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2015), 98.

¹⁴² Ibid.

The evangelist is then either a) providing his own translation of the Hebrew אוכל with a familiar word that is stylistically Johannine, τρώγω,¹⁴³ or b) simply substituting ἐσθίω from the LXX with a synonym that he uses elsewhere in his Gospel.¹⁴⁴ Whether it is through a direct translation of the Hebrew text or a substitution of a word based on the LXX, both of these approaches highlight the fact there is a conscious textual decision that leads to a clear editorial activity by the evangelist regarding the use of the word τρώγω in 13:18.¹⁴⁵ The following two textual discussions further cement the validity of the observations made so far.

2) The Fourth Gospel records the singular noun, ἄρτον, where the LXX has the plural noun, ἄρτους. Menken, in a similar manner of explaining the presence of τρώγω as a mere reflection of Johannine style, indicates that this textual difference does not need to be examined any further since the plural of לחם is not evident in Hebrew.¹⁴⁶ In other words, Menken does not see the need to investigate the meaningfulness of the singular noun ἄρτον any further than to claim that it is a stylistic decision made by the evangelist.¹⁴⁷ This line of reasoning is similarly applied to explain the difference between 3) the presence of the pronoun μου¹⁴⁸ that comes

¹⁴³ Menken supports this position. See Menken, *Old Testament*, 136.

¹⁴⁴ Schuchard presents these two options. See Schuchard, *Scripture*, 112.

¹⁴⁵ Details regarding different perspectives on textual sources will be discussed later on in this section.

¹⁴⁶ See Menken, *Old Testament*, 124 n. 8. Menken also states: “the LXX frequently translates the singular by ἄρτοι (e.g., Gen 14:18; 21:14). In any case, John’s singular ἄρτον is a more exact translation.”

¹⁴⁷ Kim, *Exegesis of Apostasy*, 182 agrees with Menken in this regard: “it is also very weak to base the connection to John 6 on the fact that ἄρτος is singular.”

¹⁴⁸ μου is supported by B C L while μετ ἐμου is supported by P⁶⁶ & A D K W Γ. External evidence seems to suggest the likelihood of the latter case but this may have been influenced by the LXX and/or Mark 14:18. For more details regarding this variant, see George R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 2nd ed.

before the singular noun, ἄρτον, in the Fourth Gospel, and the presence of the same pronoun that comes after the plural noun, ἄρτους, in the LXX. Both Menken and Schuchard note that this textual matter is a simple “minor Johannine stylistic peculiarity.”¹⁴⁹ For the evangelist, just as τρώγω is his preferred word as the present tense suppletive for the aorist φάγομαι, the position of the pronoun before the substantive is his preferred placement. This is another reminder that there are enough textual clues that indicate the evangelist as the one responsible for the quotation.¹⁵⁰

Going beyond the parameters set by Menken, Schuchard does press the matter further to suggest that the singular ἄρτον, along with the word choice of τρώγω, functions as another marker that underscores the textual and thematic connections between chapters 6 and 13. Daly-Denton seems to agree with Schuchard in this regard also, specifying that the singular ἄρτον is theologically significant as it takes the reader back to the context of the bread of life discourse where the word bread, ἄρτον, also appears in its singular form.¹⁵¹ Another important reason for

(Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1999), 229 n. i; Menken, *Old Testament*, 124 n. 7; Schuchard, *Scripture*, 108 n. 5.

¹⁴⁹ Menken, *Old Testament*, 129.

¹⁵⁰ To be consistent with the evangelist’s tendency to place the genitive before the substantive, Schuchard argues that αὐτοῦ should be placed before the substantive, τὴν πτέρναν. See Schuchard, *Scripture*, 116. Menken, *Old Testament*, 134 responds with the following: “this pre-position is by no means a rule in his gospel.” While Menken is comfortable claiming that it is not an absolute rule, Schuchard critiques Menken for not being consistent.

¹⁵¹ See John 6:31 where Ps. 77:24 is quoted. Also, while Menken may agree with the conclusion that is made about the connections between chapters 6 and 13, he stays away from attributing too much textual significance to the evidence of ἄρτον being singular. Regardless of the discussion on the significance of the word ἄρτον, there are other textual and thematic clues that are more apparent in connecting chapters 6 and 13: the use of the word τρώγω and the introduction of Judas as the betrayer. The argument of a singular ἄρτον in and of itself is weak but is not far fetched considering

affirming the connections between chapters 6 and 13 lies in the mentioning of Judas in both chapters.¹⁵² In 6:64, Jesus speaks in generality about a disciple who does not believe in his words. Following this, Judas is then introduced and hinted as the future betrayer for the first time in 6:70-71 and he is called a devil. In a way, Judas that was introduced in 6:70-71 is unveiled in 13:18. This is perhaps the most direct connection between chapters 6 and 13 aside from the word association of τρώγω. But how do these connection points (the use of τρώγω, singular ἄρτον, mentioning of Judas as the betrayer) contribute to the way Psalm 41:10 is handled textually in John 13:18? This is where the idea of belief as the central theme of chapter 6 becomes theologically significant.

Menken agrees with Schuchard and Daly-Denton that the reference to chapter 6 is to allude back to the idea of belief.¹⁵³ He suggests that in John 13:18, “to eat my bread refers to Judas’ table fellowship with Jesus, apparently without believing (cf. 6:64)”.¹⁵⁴ Judas’ unbelief even during his table fellowship with Jesus can be accurately pointed out by understanding the theological backdrop of chapter 6. Schuchard suggests something slightly different: “John, then, asserts in John 13:18 not that Judas participated in the supper on the night before Jesus’ death, but that Judas at one time believed.”¹⁵⁵ The argument is that the evangelist is portraying Judas as

other clearer clues. All in all, this particular argument needs to be situated in the broader context of seeing various connections between chapters 6 and 13.

¹⁵² Menken emphasizes the importance of Judas’ introduction in chapter 6 as one of the more primary reasons to consider the connection between chapters 6 and 13. See Menken, *Old Testament*, 136.

¹⁵³ Ibid.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 136-7.

¹⁵⁵ Schuchard, *Scripture*, 113.

someone who “ate the bread” in chapter 6, meaning, who once “believed”, but is now rebelling out of his disbelief. Menken argues that Schuchard is strangely asserting the idea of Judas’ belief in the past.¹⁵⁶ While Schuchard makes an interesting observation, the overall portrayal of Judas throughout the Fourth Gospel does not seem to support his case. Dongsu Kim notes that the key idea in properly understanding the evangelist’s portrayal of Judas is on Judas’ unbelief rather than a change of heart; or as Lindar indicates, “chosen but lost”.¹⁵⁷ Kim concludes: “we cannot deny that Jesus has chosen Judas to be one of the twelve, but according to 13:18 we can say that Jesus has not chosen Judas to be blessed by doing what the footwashing indicates.”¹⁵⁸ Menken seems to suggest an interpretation that is consistent to the overall picture of Judas in the Fourth Gospel according to Kim, while Schuchard wants to understand Jesus’ statement as a way to indirectly proclaim Judas’ change of heart. Menken and Schuchard simply disagree on how exactly the evangelist is presenting the irony of Judas’ unbelief. What they are agreeing on is the role of the bread of life discourse in understanding the language of eating bread in 13:18. The deeper meanings in light of all the textual and thematic connections (the use of the word *τρώγω*, singular *ἄρτον*, mentioning of Judas as a future betrayer, Jesus as the true bread of life) suggest that the evangelist is intentionally making his textual decisions not only to choose words that are familiar

¹⁵⁶ Menken, *Old Testament*, 137 n. 52.

¹⁵⁷ Kim, *Exegesis of Apostasy*, 182. See *ibid.*, 181 for more detailed explanations for the portrayal of Judas’ constant unbelief throughout the Fourth Gospel. Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 525-6.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 179.

to him but also to underscore various theological emphases. Understanding the backdrop of the bread of life discourse and its emphasis on the idea of belief suggests that Judas is someone who was exposed to the meaning of eating the true bread. R. Alan Culpepper notes this as an irony: “Judas refused to eat the true bread; the bread he ate had no power to give life.”¹⁵⁹ This irony is demonstrated in 13:26-27 when the bread that Jesus gives to Judas invites Satan into Judas’ heart.

It is at this point that the cultural meaning of eating bread needs to be highlighted also. The clearest and the simplest reference of eating bread points to meal sharing. Situating this in the ancient Mediterranean culture, Craig Keener notes: “for many, sharing food and drink represented the most important bond of kindness. Although relatives were the most trustworthy of all, those who ate together shared a common bond and were normally assumed to be trustworthy.”¹⁶⁰ Meal sharing was also seen to have an effect on “reconciliation between political partisans at enmity.”¹⁶¹ All in all, the communicated meaning of a strong bond is clear. In this sense, the understanding of the cultural background highlights the proximity in relationship between Jesus and Judas. Hence, the content of the quotation underscores the intimacy of the relationship in order to maximize the heinous nature of what Judas does to Jesus – lifting up his heel against him. To incorporate both the cultural and theological meaning of eating bread, we can then

¹⁵⁹ R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), 193-4.

¹⁶⁰ Keener, *John*, 1:913. Keener also provides a list of primary sources on the meaning of meal sharing in ancient Mediterranean culture. See *ibid.*

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*

conclude that the evangelist desires to point out the relational intimacy between Judas and Jesus as well as Judas' unbelief that leads him to be a betrayer.

Already from the first half of the quotation there are several things that are noteworthy about the form and function of John 13:18. The presence of *τρώγω* in 13:18 is not surprising given that the same word is used elsewhere in the Fourth Gospel (6:53-57). The same reasoning is applied to explain the presence of singular *ἄρτον* and the position of the possessive pronoun, *μου*. Therefore, the form of the quotation is in sync with Johannine style. In addition, there is no particular need to see the Eucharist as the primary background of chapters 6 and 13. The primary function of the eating language found in the bread of life discourse is to metaphorically describe the idea of believing in Jesus Christ, the true bread, and the evangelist is most likely alluding back to this idea as he employs the same word *τρώγω* and the singular *ἄρτον* in 13:18. The theological meaning of “eating bread” as it is understood in the context of chapter 6 seems to suggest that the evangelist is implying the role of belief, or lack thereof for Judas, in the understanding of 13:18. This must be the context for understanding the irony: Jesus' giving of the morsel, the bread, as the sign of identifying and confirming the betrayer (13:26-27). Along with the consideration of the ancient cultural norms of hospitality,¹⁶² the idea of Judas' unbelief highlights the absurdity of the betrayal even more. Based on the evaluation of the textual uniqueness found in the first half of the quotation, the

¹⁶² E.F. Bishop, “He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me – John xiii.18 (Ps. xl.9)” in *ET* 70 (1958-59), 331-33. Also see Gen 26:30; 31:54.

evidence seems to suggest that the evangelist is intentionally making his textual decisions to achieve the goals mentioned above.

3.5.2 “HAS LIFTED HIS HEEL AGAINST ME”

4) The Fourth Gospel translates הגדיל as ἐπῆρεν while the LXX maintains the literal meaning of הגדיל in ἐμεγάλυνεν. The textual issue is clear: הגדיל is never translated as “raising (ἐπῆρεν)” in the LXX or any other Greek translations of the OT. If this is also another evidence of the evangelist’s editorial activity, then where and how does the evangelist find the justification for his textual decision? Daly-Denton, Menken, and Schuchard all agree that the most convincing explanation can be found in the historical backdrop of Psalm 41:10.¹⁶³ Understanding how the evangelist arrives at this particular textual decision requires much consideration of the Davidic background, its hermeneutical effects, and the use of a common Jewish interpretive technique, *gezerah shawa*.

Modern scholarship often stresses the idea that each psalm should be primarily interpreted by its use and function, not so much by its supposed authorship and historical background. Rowley downplays the need for scholarly attention on the issue of Psalter authorship because it is simply “profitless to speculate”.¹⁶⁴ However, the approach to Psalter authorship must be different in the

¹⁶³ Schnackenburg, *John*, 3:26 provides another explanation for the use of this unique word, ἐπῆρεν, in the Fourth Gospel. Schnackenburg’s position is that the evangelist is providing improved Greek and is making textual edits that are theologically driven.

¹⁶⁴ H. H. Rowley, *Worship in Ancient Israel: Its Forms and Meaning* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1967), 212.

task of understanding the NT use of the OT. In the realm of the NT use of the OT, the point is not to minimize the value of assessing historical accuracy but to highlight the importance of the interpretive norms regarding the OT texts during the days of the NT authors.¹⁶⁵ In the context of understanding Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18, even at a detailed textual level, it is crucial to assess the hermeneutical effects of Davidic authorship. Did the evangelist have in mind the Davidic backdrop for Psalm 41 when quoting Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18? What does this mean theologically and hermeneutically for the evangelist? How might this affect the evangelist's textual decisions, particularly for the case of translating הגדיל as ἐπῆρεν?

As was mentioned in the previous chapter, there are ample reasons to conclude that the assumption of Davidic authorship was normative in the Second Temple Jewish period. Later Jewish writings also affirm that the Davidic background and Ahithophelian association should be considered the context for better understanding the content of Psalm 41 and 55. Given the Davidic background in these two psalms, it is safe to assume that the presence of the same key word הגדיל (see chart below) that is found in both Psalm 41 and 55 is not coincidental. At the very least, this confirms that the connections between the two psalms are both

¹⁶⁵ See section 2.1.1 Davidic authorship.

Psalm 41:10	Psalm 55:13-14
גם־איש שלומי אשר־בטחתי בו אוכל לחמי הגדיל עלי עקב	עלי הגדיל ואסתר ממנו ואתה אנוש בערכי אלופי ומידעי
Even the man of my peace whom I trusted in, who ate my bread, has <u>made</u> <u>his heel great</u> against me	Nor is it an enemy who has <u>exalted</u> <u>himself</u> against me, then I can hide myself from him. But it is you, a man my equal, my companion and my familiar friend.

textual (common key word) and thematic (common historical backdrop). With these evidences in mind, the idea that the evangelist is employing a Jewish interpretive technique, *gezerah shawa*, for the textual choice of ἐπῆρεν for הגדיל becomes much more convincing.¹⁶⁶

Gezerah shawa (גזירה שוה) is one of the seven basic rabbinic exegetical attributes that are ascribed and accredited to Rabbi Hillel during early rabbinic Judaism. It is important to consider that these exegetical and interpretive techniques reflect the Jewish hermeneutical norms during the first century. The presence of all seven exegetical techniques¹⁶⁷ found in the NT demonstrates how widely accepted these techniques were during the first century.¹⁶⁸ Examples of *gezerah shawa* in particular in the NT are spread throughout the NT.¹⁶⁹ Longenecker defines *gezerah shawa* as: “verbal analogy from one verse to another; where the same words are

¹⁶⁶ In this case, the connections that the later Jewish exegetes made with David and Ahithopehl in Ps. 41 and Psalm 55 reflect the connection that is made here both textually and thematically.

¹⁶⁷ The seven rules are the following: *Qal wa-homer*, *Gezerah shawa*, *Binyan ‘ab mikkatub ‘ehad*, *Binyan ‘ab mishshene ketubim*, *Kelal uperat uperat ukelal*, *Kayotze bo mi-maqom ‘aher*, *Dabar halamed me’inyano*.

¹⁶⁸ See C. A. Evans, *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005), 218-19.

¹⁶⁹ See Rom 4:3-7 or Heb 7:1-28. In the Fourth Gospel, see John 6:31; 12:15, 40.

applied to two separate cases, it follows that the same considerations apply to both.”¹⁷⁰ Hays provides a simpler definition: “catchword linkage of two texts”.¹⁷¹ The logical flow of understanding the rationale for *gezerah shawa* in the case of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18 is as follows: If the context of David and Ahithophel mentioned throughout 2 Sam 15-18 is to be seen as the historical backdrop of Psalm 41 and 55, then by association, the evangelist finds the justification to use a catchword in the backdrop text of the two psalms to be used in the quotation of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18. Simply put, the evangelist’s textual decision to translate הַגִּדִּיל as ἐπῆρεν is influenced by another text that describes David’s experience of betrayal from Ahithophel. Many scholars acknowledge the use of *gezerah shawa* in this context. The contention, however, among certain scholars lies in the discussion of the backdrop text: From which specific text did the evangelist get influenced to translate הַגִּדִּיל as ἐπῆρεν? This leads to one of the few distinct differences in the arguments made by Menken and Schuchard regarding this specific quotation.

Menken does start his analysis of this specific textual issue with the acknowledgement of the Davidic background that is hermeneutically effective for the evangelist: “In view of the pre-Christian tendency to connect psalms with David’s biography and the later explicit ‘Ahithophelian’ interpretations of parts of Psalm 41 and 55, it is only reasonable to suppose that such an interpretation of Psalm 41:10

¹⁷⁰ Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 20.

¹⁷¹ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 13.

was usual at the time the fourth evangelist wrote his Gospel.”¹⁷² Having established this, Menken notes that the evangelist is employing *gezerah shawa* in his quotation using a catchword from 2 Sam 18:28. This specific verse is located within the context of David’s hearing of Absalom’s death. Ahimaaz, the son of Zadok, eagerly sets out to declare the news of Absalom’s death to David (18:19). When he is given the opportunity to report to David, Ahimaaz declares: “Blessed be the Lord your God, who has delivered up the men who *raised* their hand (נשאו את־ידם) against my lord the king” (18:28). Given the story of David and Absalom in the chapters leading up to 2 Sam 18, Ahithophel belongs to one of these “men who raised their hand”. The phrase, “raising their hand”, metaphorically describes the act of betrayal. Menken highlights various connections between Psalm 41:10 and 2 Sam 18:28.¹⁷³ In these two passages, key words of association, “peace” and “man”, are worth mentioning

Psalm 41:10	2 Sam 18:28
גם־איש שלומי אשר־בטחתי בו אוכל לחמי הגדיל עלי עקב	ויקרא אחימעץ ויאמר אל־המלך שלום וישתחו למלך לאפיו ארצה ס ויאמר ברוך יהוה אלהיך אשר סגר את־האנשים אשר־נשאו את־ידם באדני המלך
Even the <u>man</u> of my <u>peace</u> whom I trusted in, who ate my bread, has made his heel great against me	Then Ahimaaz called and said to the king, “ <u>All is well.</u> ” And he prostrated himself before the king with his face to the ground. And he said, “Blessed is the Lord your God, who has delivered up the <u>men</u> who raised their hands against my lord the king.”

¹⁷² Menken, *Old Testament*, 133. Menken is putting together the already explicit tendency in the Second Temple Jewish period to connect psalms with David’s life and the initially implicit but later explicit Ahithophelian association made by various Jewish exegetes in the texts that were mentioned in chapters 2: m. Abot 6.3, b. Sanh 106b, Tg. 55, 14.

¹⁷³ Schuchard agrees with Menken. See Schuchard, *Scripture*, 115; Menken, *Old Testament*, 133.

(see chart above). In the broader context of comparing Psalm 41 and 2 Sam 18, there are other notable similarities as well: 1) the blessing of deliverance mentioned in 2 Sam 18:28 (Blessed is the Lord your God...) and the final note of blessing in Psalm 41:14 (Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel...); 2) the references to the enemies in 2 Sam 18:32 (May the enemies of my lord the king...) and Psalm 41:6 (My enemies speak evil against me...). The evaluation of the broader context further supports the idea that 2 Sam 18 is to be seen as the general background text for the evangelist when quoting Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18.

Given the content and the textual connections in 2 Sam 18:28 and Psalm 41:10, Menken suggests that the evangelist is employing *gezerah shawa* to arrive at the decision to translate הגדיל as ἐπῆρεν. Menken states: “Because the two verses can be considered as analogous, it was legitimate to replace ‘making great’ in Psalm 41:10 by ‘raising’ from 2 Sam 18:28, which results in a clear and unequivocal translation of the psalm verse.”¹⁷⁴ This means that the evangelist saw the justification of replacing the literal meaning of הגדיל with a metaphorical one in ἐπῆρεν based on the evangelist’s understanding of Psalm 41:10 and its Davidic background text, 2 Sam 18:28. One of the difficulties in this argument is that the LXX does not translate נשא in 2 Sam 18:28 as ἐπῆρεν but μισοῦντας. Based on the evidence of the word μισοῦντας as the translation of the Hebrew, it is apparent that the original Hebrew was read שנוא instead of נשא. Menken understands this to be a

¹⁷⁴ Menken, *Old Testament*, 133-4.

result of scribal error or purposeful edition.¹⁷⁵ Evidenced by the variants of this verb in the LXX, it is apparent that there were attempts made to correct what appeared to be a textual error.¹⁷⁶ In any case, Menken stands by 2 Sam 18:28 to be the OT source for *gezerah shawa* in John 13:18 and works around the textual difficulty of the LXX by indicating that “the translation of Ps 41:10 in John 13:18 was influenced by the Hebrew text of 2 Sam 18:28 or by a corrected Greek translation of this verse.”¹⁷⁷ Menken then alludes to 2 Sam 20:21, where the phrase נִשָּׂא יָדוֹ בַּמֶּלֶךְ is translated in the LXX as the following: ἐπῆρεν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπ’ τὸν βασιλεῖα. Here, the same word found in John 13:18, ἐπῆρεν, is used by the LXX to translate נִשָּׂא. For Menken, this textual evidence reveals how 2 Sam 18:28 ought to have been translated.

Schuchard also discusses these matters in his analysis of the quotation. The agreements between Menken and Schuchard are widespread and therefore significant. Schuchard firmly acknowledges the presence of Davidic overtones in the quotation of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18. He acknowledges that first century Jewish assumptions about Psalm 41:10 are interpretively critical and significant. He affirms the analogous relationship between Psalm 41:10 and 2 Sam 18:28. However, there is one fundamental difference that can be noted in Schuchard’s approach. Schuchard’s overarching argument in his work is that the LXX is the default text of reference for all the OT quotations in the Fourth Gospel.¹⁷⁸ He proposes that there is no

¹⁷⁵ Menken, *Old Testament*, 134.

¹⁷⁶ Other attempts have been made to correct μισουντας: Ανταραντας and επαραμενους. The evidence of the attempts alone suggests that there is a recognition of a textual issue.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁷⁸ See Schuchard, *Scripture*, xi.

compelling reason to reject this notion even for the quotations that appear to be very different from the translations of the LXX. Given this context, Schuchard's specific contribution in his analysis of John 13:18 is understandable. While Menken considers the textual evidence of 2 Sam 20:21 as a source of confirmation for understanding 2 Sam 18:28 as the main backdrop for *gezerah shawa*, Schuchard regards 2 Sam 20:21 to be the actual main backdrop text. Schuchard argues that 2 Sam 20:21, given its Davidic context and the clear evidence of the word ἐπῆρεν in the LXX, should be considered the direct background text for the evangelist.¹⁷⁹ While both Menken and Schuchard agree that much of the conversation is rooted in the Davidic background material of Psalm 41, Menken does make it clear that he disagrees with Schuchard's overarching agenda: "Schuchard is here a victim of his own theory that John exclusively used the LXX."¹⁸⁰ Schuchard is unapologetically arguing for the idea that the LXX is the only operative textual source for the evangelist and this does seem to be an agenda that unnecessarily shapes his analysis of all the psalm quotations in the Fourth Gospel that differ textually from the LXX. While this may achieve a certain logical consistency for Schuchard, it may not entirely reflect the way the evangelist actually interacted with the sources that were available to him. To be fair, there is some guessing work done by both Menken and Schuchard regarding this specific analysis. While I agree with Menken's argument

¹⁷⁹ See *ibid.*, 116. Also see Kim, *Exegesis of Apostasy*, 184-5 for detailed explanations on why he disagrees with Schuchard when it comes to understanding 2 Sam 20:21 as the source of *gezerah shawa* for the evangelist. One important thing to note is that while the Davidic association for both 2 Sam 18 and 2 Sam 20 is likely, Sheba in 2 Sam 20 is not considered an insider like Ahithophel.

¹⁸⁰ Menken, *Old Testament*, 134 n. 45.

that 2 Sam 18:28 is to be seen as the primary place that the evangelist finds the justification for employing *gezerah shawa*, it is important to note that both scholars are acknowledging that the presence of a unique textual evidence found in John 13:18 is not due to a random editorial activity but an intentional one that would have been recognized and accepted as a common Jewish interpretive technique during the days of the evangelist.

5) It is in this context that Menken and Schuchard's explanations for the unique presence of αὐτοῦ in the Fourth Gospel must be discussed also. Menken argues that the presence of αὐτοῦ in the Fourth Gospel, when it is absent in the LXX, can be explained by the textual connections between 2 Sam 18:28 and Psalm 41:10 as well. The phrase, "his hand" in the Fourth Gospel is assumed to have been influenced by the phrase, "their hand", in 2 Sam 18:28. This background, for Menken, provides the best explanation for the presence of the third person pronoun in the Fourth Gospel. Schuchard disagrees. Schuchard argues that Menken contradicts himself in this analysis. Schuchard points out that if Menken is correct in his earlier assessment about the evangelist's stylistic tendency to place personal pronouns before the substantive,¹⁸¹ then one should expect to see αὐτοῦν τὴν πτέρναν, not τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ. While Menken does note that the evangelist does not need to be strictly bounded by his tendency to front the pronouns, Schuchard sees this as a

¹⁸¹ See discussion for μου in section 3.5.1 "He Who Ate My Bread".

sign of inconsistency.¹⁸² Schuchard then points to 2 Sam 20:21 in the LXX because it is there that the exact phrase, τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ, is found. Based on the level of textual connections, this specific textual note does seem to favor Schuchard's approach. While Menken is downplaying the importance of word order in this case, Schuchard is grounding his case textually by mentioning where the exact phrase is found in the LXX. It may be reasonable to suggest then that both passages, 2 Sam 18:28 and 20:21, with varying degrees, may indeed be operative for the evangelist.

Another explanation for the presence of this pronoun lies in the possible relationship between John 13:18 and Gen 3:15. In the LXX, the only place other than Psalm 41:10 that the noun πτέρναν and the pronoun αὐτοῦ are mentioned together in a phrase is in Gen 3:15. While there must be other convincing reasons to support this connection, it is interesting to note that the larger theme of ultimate good and evil does loom over Gen 3:15 and John 13:18, which allows one to argue that the evangelist is hinting at the completion of the story of ultimate evil against ultimate good that began all the way back in Gen 3:15. This would suggest that the death of Jesus that is introduced in John 13:18 by the betrayal of Judas is one way of signaling the fulfillment of what was promised in Gen 3:15.¹⁸³

6) The Fourth Gospel translates כָּע as πτέρναν but the LXX translates it as πτερνισμόν. Menken suggests that the most literal translation of the last phrase of Psalm 41:10 would be μεγάλυνεν τὴν πτέρναν. The Fourth Gospel does maintain this

¹⁸² Again, in my opinion, Schuchard seems to hold onto his particular logical consistency at the cost of understanding what may have been normative for the evangelist and his context.

¹⁸³ A more detailed analysis of this possible connection will be mentioned in section 3.6.

literal translation. There may be a theological explanation for this textual note. The translation value of עקב as πτερνισμός in the LXX can be better understood in the context of its uses elsewhere in Scripture. Menken explains that the translator of the LXX “derived עקב from the verb עקב qal, ‘to seize at the heel, to beguile’, or he read it as, or made it into an equivalent of, the substantive עקבה, ‘insidiousness’.”¹⁸⁴ The substantive occurs in 2 Kgs 10:19 while the verb occurs in Gen 27:36, Jer 9:3, and Hos 12:4. Menken provides his explanation for why the LXX chose not to translate עקב with the most literal sense: “[This] made it possible for the LXX translator to combine a minimum of comprehensibility of the Greek with a maximum of literal translation from the Hebrew.”¹⁸⁵ This means that the translator of the LXX wanted to further explain the concept of the idiomatic phrase without deviating too much from the textual evidence itself. This would have been a very detailed and meticulous textual decision made by the translator. However, through this process, the nuance of beguiling and deceitfulness was unintentionally introduced. The evidence of this newly introduced nuance is also reflected in Targum.¹⁸⁶ Menken, Schuchard, and Daly-Denton all agree that the evangelist may have maintained the literal translation in order to steer away from the idea that Jesus could have been tricked by Judas in an unforeseen manner. Daly-Denton concludes: “Certainly, the idea that Judas ‘made great craft,’ implying the cunning deception of an unsuspecting Jesus, would be

¹⁸⁴ Menken, *Old Testament*, 130.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 130-31.

¹⁸⁶ Tg. Ps. 41, 10: “acts mightly to outwit me”.

utterly inappropriate.”¹⁸⁷ Schuchard also considers this to be the most qualifying explanation for the textual difference between the Fourth Gospel and the LXX: “For John, however, the idea that Judas beguiled Jesus cannot be reconciled with the Johannine portrait of Jesus’ omniscience.”¹⁸⁸ This phenomenon is also true of the following textual note.

7) The first half of Psalm 41:10 (even the man of my peace whom I trusted in) is not quoted in John 13:18. This discussion is not necessarily centered on a specific textual matter; rather, it asks why the evangelist only quoted the second half of Psalm 41:10 and not the first. While the answer may simply be that the evangelist only considered the second half of the verse to be relevant and significant, it may also be that the decision was driven by a theological agenda. Given the possible theological explanation for the previous textual note, the evangelist may also have decided to forego the first half of the quotation to keep the same theological goal in mind: to avoid portraying Jesus as being blindsided by an unexpected betrayal from a trusted man of peace. Köstenberger summarizes this in the following statement: “His nonuse of the LXX in the present case is noteworthy in light of his customary closeness to it, and this can be explained by the fact that its reference to the one who is betrayed having trusted in his close friend was judged christologically unsuitable by the Fourth Evangelist, who regularly affirms Jesus’ full foreknowledge of

¹⁸⁷ Daly-Denton, *David*, 193.

¹⁸⁸ Schuchard, *Scripture*, 117.

events.”¹⁸⁹ In this way, the theological goal of obtaining high Christology is effectively operative for the evangelist’s decision to translate עקב as *πρέβαν* and also to leave out the first half of Psalm 41:10 when quoting it in John 13:18.

I now come back to the question of sources asked primarily by Menken and Schuchard. While much of their content is very similar, their understanding of sources is indeed different. Simply put, Menken suggests that there is a particular theological reason for the evangelist’s non-use of the LXX in this specific quotation while Schuchard suggests that nothing rules out the possibility of having LXX as the primary source for the evangelist. What is clear is that the form of the quotation in John 13:18 is noticeably different from the translation found in the LXX. This is precisely the reason why Schuchard argues his point passively, to suggest that there is no reason to reject the LXX as a source given that other places in the Fourth Gospel do seem to interact rather closely with the LXX. This defensive approach by Schuchard does make sense when the parsimonious explanation for the noticeably different textual evidences between the Fourth Gospel and the LXX is that the evangelist simply did not refer to the LXX for this specific quotation but perhaps provided his own translation of the Hebrew. Schuchard’s contribution to this discussion is that there may be enough pieces of the LXX that are still identifiable once all the interpretive techniques are considered. Schuchard is suggesting that the LXX did shape the evangelist’s textual decisions and that he deviated away from the LXX only when necessary. For Menken, because the LXX is not a necessary textual

¹⁸⁹ Köstenberger, “John”, 488.

source, what Schuchard calls evidences of occasional textual deviance, Menken calls evidences of non-use. All of their minor disagreements regarding sources essentially find their roots in this main argument.

While I am inclined to side with Menken on most of his points including the evangelist's use of sources, there are several details that Schuchard bring to light that are helpful to note. For example, regarding the textual origin of ἐπῆρεν in John 13:18, the discussion of whether the background text is from 2 Sam 18:28 (Menken) or 20:21 (Schuchard) does not need to be any more complicated than to simply acknowledge that the evangelist may be working with both texts in mind and that he could have been fully aware of the latter text in the LXX. Both Menken and Schuchard agree with this notion but ultimately disagrees on which text is to be seen as the primary background source and the other, complementary. However, the evangelist may not have been interested in this particular question at all. The textual evidences reflected in the Fourth Gospel are not largely driven by the evangelist's goal to stay away from the LXX as much as possible and it is also not driven by the evangelist's need to seek approval from the LXX for legitimizing his textual decisions. Bauckham understands this in the following way: "Like most of the New Testament writers, John not only uses the Septuagint as his regular form of the Old Testament text, but also knows the Hebrew text and, when the point he is making requires it, may allude directly to the latter."¹⁹⁰ Bauckham is simply noting that the

¹⁹⁰ Bauckham, *Testimony*, 246.

evangelist did not have a problem with this seemingly non-dogmatic approach to sources and neither should we.

All in all, the emphasis rightly needs to be made that the evangelist is likely using known texts with specific and informed reasons to arrive at his editorial decisions. In other words, both Menken and Schuchard would agree that the evangelist does indeed see various theological reasons that give him the justification to arrive at his particular textual evidences that are found uniquely in the Fourth Gospel. Kim helpfully provides this conclusion: “John’s style of quoting the OT evinces intentional deviations from a particular textual tradition in order to adapt a citation to its eventual literary and theological context.”¹⁹¹ The evangelist is not unpredictable or random but in fact very meticulous and purposeful in his ways to deviate from a known text. In a way, we can conclude that there is some freedom in the way the evangelist approaches his sources but this certainly does not mean that he treats his textual decisions for his quotations carelessly. In fact, there are highly theological motives that are identifiable in the ways that the evangelist approaches his detailed textual decisions.

3.6 FURTHER THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS FROM PSALM 41:10 IN JOHN 13:18

How is it that Jesus can claim his context to be the fulfillment of what was said in Psalm 41:10? How is it that Jesus can now interpret Psalm 41:10 to be

¹⁹¹ Kim, *Exegesis of Apostasy*, 181.

prophetic or futuristic? Gregory Beale understands John 13:18 as a case of “indirect fulfillment of Old Testament typological prophecy”.¹⁹² It is indirect because the content of the fulfillment is “implicitly foreshadowed”, not “explicitly predicted”.¹⁹³ To understand why this is a typological prophecy, we must assess a few things regarding typology.¹⁹⁴

Beale provides the following working definition of typology: “The study of analogical correspondences among revealed truths about persons, events, institutions, and other things within the historical framework of God’s special revelation, which, from a retrospective view, are of a prophetic nature and are escalated in their meaning.”¹⁹⁵ He then gives the following five essential characteristics of typology: “1) analogical correspondence, 2) historicity, 3) a pointing-forwardness (i.e., an aspect of foreshadowing or presignification), 4)

¹⁹² G.K. Beale, *Handbook On the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 57.

¹⁹³ Ibid. See Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 2-3 for the distinction between prediction and prefiguration. Hays states: “Figural reading of the Bible need not presume that the Old Testament authors – or the characters they narrate – were conscious of predicting or anticipating Christ. Rather, the discernment of a figural correspondence is necessarily retrospective rather than prospective.” Beale makes the distinction between the two types of prospective reading (implicit foreshadowing and explicit prediction) while Hays makes the distinction between prospective (reading forwards) and retrospective (reading backwards) reading.

¹⁹⁴ See Goppelt, *Typos*, 198: “typology is the method of interpreting Scripture that is predominant in the NT and characteristic of it.”

¹⁹⁵ Beale, *Handbook*, 14. Beale’s definition considers the effects of the redemptive-historical framework when understanding typology. For a similar working definition, see David L. Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible: the Theological Relationship between the Old and New Testaments*, 3rd ed. (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2010), 267. G. P. Hugenberger, “Introductory Notes on Typology” in *The Right Doctrine From the Wrong Text? Essays On the Use of the Old Testament in the New* (ed. G. K. Beale; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 337 explains two major views that compete against the redemptive-historical view: Goulder’s literary view and von Rad’s historical interpretation view. Both emphasize the need to establish stricter boundaries for understanding types.

escalation, and 5) retrospection.”¹⁹⁶ Typology is certainly a unique concept within the larger discussion regarding the NT use of the OT. With the use of types, some argue that the NT writers are uncovering meanings that are subdued but surely embedded in the OT. Some argue that the NT writers are formulating brand new meanings out of the OT but that these are warranted and guided by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Some would also argue that the NT writers are misreading or intentionally distorting the OT.¹⁹⁷ The point of discussion lies on this question: How much continuity or discontinuity is there between the NT and the OT? For example, Craigie explains that the words of Psalm 41:10 “are *transformed* into what amounts to a prophetic prediction of betrayal in the life of Jesus.”¹⁹⁸ By suggesting that the words of Psalm 41:10 are “transformed”, Craigie communicates the idea that what is happening to Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18 is indeed new and foreign.

The evidence seems to suggest that Jesus, being fully aware of the historical context and the authorial intention of Psalm 41:10, is applying a typological reading that is centered on himself. At face value, this may seem like an arbitrary exegetical move by Jesus but it is important to understand that he is taking a meaning or a theme that is already in the OT and appropriating that to his own context. As Beale points out in his definition of typology, it is essential to understand that the OT as a

¹⁹⁶ Beale, *Handbook*, 14.

¹⁹⁷ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 3-4 mentions Udo Schnelle, a distinguished German New Testament scholar, who rejects the very idea of biblical theology. He necessarily stands against Hays’ vision for understanding the OT. Schnelle’s reasons for his claim are: “1) the Old Testament is *silent* about Jesus Christ, and 2) the resurrection from the dead *of one who was crucified* cannot be integrated into any ancient system of meaning formation.”

¹⁹⁸ Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 323. Emphasis, mine.

whole has a forward-movement momentum.¹⁹⁹ Carson's note regarding Jesus' hermeneutic is helpful here: "The appeal should be made, not to some hidden divine knowledge, but to the pattern of revelation up to that time - a pattern not yet adequately [or fully] discerned."²⁰⁰ Again, this means that Jesus is appropriating and fulfilling a theme that is already present within the OT itself. This also means that there may be more continuity than discontinuity in what Jesus is doing with Psalm 41:10. This is ultimately what the evangelist is highlighting even further to communicate contextually to his audience about the way Jesus chose to speak of himself using Psalm 41:10. The evangelist's specific word choices and textual decisions are clues for understanding how he wants to further emphasize what Jesus was doing when quoting Psalm 41:10. Given this typological reading of the psalm, what are some significant theological implications that need to be emphasized even further?

One of the most important theological implications from this analysis is the connection that the evangelist is drawing out between the betrayal of Judas against Jesus and that of Ahithophel against David. John 13:18 is not necessarily the main scriptural anchor that confirms these connections but it certainly functions as a reflection of an early Jewish thought. The assumptions of Davidic authorship and Ahithophelian association that are noticeable in later Jewish texts then affirm the hermeneutical norm that is revealed in John 13:18. The element of betrayal is a clear

¹⁹⁹ This is understood within the redemptive historical framework of typology.

²⁰⁰ D.A. Carson, *Matthew* (Expositor's Bible Commentary; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995), 1:92.

theme that runs through and ties the two stories together but the details that are shared between the two relationships are certainly noteworthy. The parallels are too noticeable to be coincidental. The evidence seems to point to the idea that the evangelist is fully aware of the connections he makes when portraying Jesus as the ultimate David and Judas as the ultimate Ahithophel. This is perhaps one of the most important and significant theological connections that must be brought forth to understand why this quotation is placed where it is and why it functions the way it does.

In 2 Sam 15:23, David finds himself crossing the brook Kidron when fleeing from Absalom, his own son, and Ahithophel, his betrayer; John 18:1 opens the scene of the passion narrative by introducing Jesus crossing the Kidron. In 2 Sam 15:30-31, on the Mount of Olives, David finds himself agonizing over the state of his life as someone who has to flee from those who are suppose to be his dearest; Mark 14:32-42 and Luke 22:39-46 describe Jesus on the same mount crying out to God to take the cup away if possible. In 2 Sam 17:1-4, Ahithophel attempts to take David's life and causes the men of David to flee; in Matt 26:47-56, Mark 14:43-52, Luke 22:47-53, and John 18:2-12, Judas attempts to capture Jesus and this causes the disciples to flee. In 2 Sam 17:3, in the context of Ahithophel's betrayal, people perceive the death of David to be a necessary piece in bringing peace to the nation; John 11:50 describes the scene where Caiaphas claims: "it is better for you that one man should die for the people, not that the whole nation should perish". In 2 Sam 17:23, Ahithophel hangs himself; in Matt 27:5, Judas also hangs himself after his repentance. Ahithophel's

death is the only case of suicide outside of a war context in the OT and the same is the case for Judas's death in the NT. All of these points that connect these two situations together are greatly emphasized by Menken, Schuchard, Daly-Denton, Glasson, and many more. Menken provides even more evidence to solidify this case. Menken notes the textual connection between 2 Sam 17:23 (καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ... ἀπήγξατο) and Matt 27:5 (καὶ ἀπελθὼν ἀπήγξατο) where the scenes of Ahithophel's and Judas' suicide are described respectively. Considering this overwhelming proof of parallelism from multiple angles and sources, it is safe to conclude that the evangelist was fully aware of this rich theological background when approaching the quotation of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18. In this case, the evaluation of the theological implication further supports the evangelist's use of *gezerah shawa* in John 13:18.

With this connection in mind, Jesus' viewing of himself and the evangelist's portrayal of Jesus as the ultimate David need to be assessed carefully. Köstenberger states: "The reference to Ps. 41:9 in John 13:18 is further evidence to Jesus' self-consciousness of standing in the messianic line of David and as fulfilling the pattern of the righteous sufferer who faced opposition from friend and foe alike but who would be vindicated by God."²⁰¹ This statement captures the presence of Davidic typology that sees its fulfillment in Jesus. In this specific case, what is highlighted through the quotation is Davidic suffering that is prophetically put on the shoulders of Jesus. Glasson notes: "the son of David repeats the sad journey of his ancestor."²⁰²

²⁰¹ Köstenberger, "John", 488.

²⁰² Glasson, "Davidic Links", 118.

Davidic typology is certainly not a foreign concept in the Fourth Gospel²⁰³ as Jesus is claimed as the Davidic Messiah in several places in the Fourth Gospel.²⁰⁴ With this context in mind, Jesus' appropriation of Psalm 41:10 in his experience of betrayal is not merely prophetic but also typological, in that the quotation reveals the motive of Jesus and the theological agenda of the evangelist to portray Jesus as the Davidic Messiah, the righteous sufferer. In a way, Jesus is simultaneously expressing his position as the righteous sufferer and providing a much larger theological category to properly understand the role of suffering, particularly betrayal, for a Davidic Messiah. In other words, the Messiah must be a righteous sufferer and this is not a result of an accident; it is a scriptural fulfillment.

The reading of Psalm 41:10 in its context provides more ways to understand Jesus' identity as well. The verses that follow Psalm 41:10 describe the confidence of David, that he will be vindicated and raised up (41:11),²⁰⁵ triumphing over evil. How does Jesus fulfill this confidence of victory? He triumphs over evil through his death and resurrection. Köstenberger argues that the use of Psalm 41:10 is not only helpful in detecting "Jesus' self-consciousness of standing in the messianic line of David and as fulfilling the pattern of the righteous sufferer who faced opposition from friend

²⁰³ See Menken, *Old Testament*, 136; Daly-Denton, *David*, 5-8; Andreas J. Köstenberger, "Jesus the Good Shepherd Who Will Also Bring Other Sheep (John 10:16): The Old Testament Background of a Familiar Metaphor," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 12.1 (2002): 67-96; Goppelt, *Typos*, 36-39, 82-90.

²⁰⁴ See, John 1:41,49; 7:26-27, 41-42; 9:22; 10:24-25; 11:27; 12:13, 15; 18:33-19:22; 20:31.

²⁰⁵ The resurrection language can be detected in the way the LXX translates "raise me up" in Ps 41:11 as ἀνάστησόν με. The verb ἀνίστημι in the NT refers to the act of rising up, coming back from the dead. See "ἀνίστημι", *BDAG*, 83. The evangelist often uses this word in the Fourth Gospel to refer to the idea of believing and rising up on the last day. See John 6:39, 44, 54; 20:9.

and foe alike (41:5-8)”²⁰⁶ but also his eventual vindication by God (41:10-12). This is already previewed in John 8:28, where Jesus claims that the disciples will know who he truly is when they have “lifted up the Son of Man”.²⁰⁷ Bauckham argues for the double meaning in the phrase, “lifted up”: “It refers both literally to the crucifixion as a lifting up of Jesus above the earth (as 12:33 makes clear) and figuratively to the same event as Jesus’ elevation to the status of divine sovereignty over the cosmos.”²⁰⁸ Interpretively speaking, the evangelist may have been aware of the literary context of Psalm 41:10 when considering the function of the quotation as it relates to the “I am” statement in John 13:19. This means, “the foretelling of the betrayal by Judas, which initiates the process of death and resurrection, will help to bring the disciples to believe in the Jesus who has been lifted up to his Father.”²⁰⁹

Ahithophel as a type of Judas has to be evaluated carefully as well. After all, the quotation is directed towards Judas. If the parallel seen in Jesus and David is to be compared to that of Judas and Ahithophel, then the implications are significant. Seeing and evaluating the Scripture in its entirety and understanding the tendency of the NT to continue the overarching biblical narrative of redemption that runs

²⁰⁶ Köstenberger, *John*, 487.

²⁰⁷ Also see John 3:14-15 and 12:32-34 where the phrases, “lift up” and “Son of Man” are mentioned together. See Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel*, 46-50. Bauckham (Ibid., 48) makes the argument that these “three Son of Man sayings together, not simply repeating but complementing each other, make this comprehensive point: the cross reveals the divine identity in Jesus (8:28), such that all people are drawn to him (12:32) for salvation (3:14-15).” Andrew Lincoln, *John*, 269 provides a helpful summary as well: “the language of ‘lifting up’ (cf. Isa. 52.13) has been taken from Isa. 40-55. The reworking of these elements now indicates in striking fashion that it is the lifting up on the cross that will be the means by which the divine identity and glory of Jesus, who is also the servant-witness, will be revealed... So far from such a death being Jesus’ humiliation, it is to be seen as his exaltation.”

²⁰⁸ Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel*, 48.

²⁰⁹ Lincoln, *John*, 269.

throughout Scripture, one has to wonder if the clear juxtaposition drawn between Jesus as the righteous sufferer and Judas as the betrayer warrants itself to be read in a larger biblical narrative context. This is how Walter Kaiser sees the dynamic between the line of promise and the line of evil that begins even from Gen 3:15 to be reflected in John 13:18. It might be more appropriate to say that John 13:18 reflects the reality captured in Gen 3:15 as it introduces the main tension that anchors the gradual unfolding of all tensions revealed in Scripture. For Kaiser, the typological relationships detected in John 13:18 must be interpreted in light of the larger biblical tension between the line of promise and the line of evil. Kaiser states: “Accordingly, along with finding Messiah in the Seed promises of the OT, we also find on the flip side of the same promise-doctrine a line of those opposing the promised line, such as Ahithophel, Absalom, and later Judas and the Antichrist.”²¹⁰ Tracing these names indicates that Kaiser is highlighting the place of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18 not only from its immediate literary context but also from a larger redemptive historical context. Kaiser’s effort is to understand the depiction of evil and good in John 13:18 within the larger biblical portrayal of evil and good. Is this indeed what the evangelist had in mind? Does the quotation bear in mind the larger biblical narrative of evil and good? Culpepper argues that this can be demonstrated in the way that the evangelist uniquely portrays Judas in the Fourth Gospel: “He is picked by the devil

²¹⁰ Walter Kaiser, “Single Meaning, Unified Referents,” *Three Views on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (K. Berding and J. Lunde eds.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008), 63.

(13:2) and controlled by him (13:27). He is in fact ‘a devil’ (6:70; cf. 13:18).”²¹¹ In addition, this study has shown so far that the quotation is capable of being something much more than just a mere appropriation or prediction of events. Embedded in the understanding of Jesus’ suffering in light of David’s suffering is a much richer context of Jesus’ understanding of himself as the Messiah. This has been demonstrated most effectively from the evaluation of the way the evangelist understood the Davidic context of Psalm 41:10 and textually reflected the understanding in John 13:18 through the use of *gezerah shawa*. This then begs the question: in a similar manner, can Kaiser’s observation also be supported textually? Are there enough clues for seeing the role or influence of Gen 3:15 in John 13:18? Are there more concrete ways to evaluate this quotation’s role in the larger picture of the battle between evil and good in Scripture? This leads to the assessment of the word עקב again.²¹²

Brown, who is critical of the possible relationship between John 13:18 and Gen 3:15, does acknowledge the textual connection between the two verses but rejects any possible thematic relationship between them.²¹³ While I do agree with Brown that Gen 3:15 is not likely the main operating background source for the evangelist, there are several things that are noteworthy about the relationship between the two texts. A) The word “heel” is mentioned in both places. This

²¹¹ Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 124.

²¹² See a short survey of the biblical theological analysis of the word עקב mentioned in chapter 2. See section 2.2 Exegetical Analysis of Psalm 41:10.

²¹³ Brown, *John XIII-XXI*, 554 n. 18.

particular word is not used often in the OT, which increases the possibility of the connection. B) The phrase *πτέρναν αὐτοῦ* in John 13:18 is very similar to the way the LXX translates the end of Gen 3:15: *αὐτοῦ πτέρναν*. This is especially noteworthy considering that the presence of *αὐτοῦ* in John 13:18 is a unique textual decision by the evangelist. C) Thematically, the idea of enemy or evil is certainly present in both contexts. Judas is clearly associated with the devil in the Fourth Gospel (6:70). In this case, to extend the thematic connection even further, what Judas did to Jesus is not merely a reflection of what Ahithophel did to David. The story of Ahithophel and David is yet another reality of the larger biblical story of a war between evil and good, and Jesus is fulfilling and completing that larger story that necessarily includes the story of Ahithophel and David. Through the betrayal of Judas that eventually sends Jesus to the cross, Jesus then defeats death once and for all by his own death.²¹⁴

However, there are some difficulties with this assessment. In John 13:18, the one who lifts up the heel is Judas and the one who unfairly receives this betrayal is Jesus. In Gen 3:15, it is the seed of the woman who strikes the head of the seed of the serpent and it is the seed of the serpent that strikes the heel of the seed of the

²¹⁴ Some may question how it is possible that a terrible event in the NT -- in this case, a betrayal that leads to one's death on the cross -- can be understood as a fulfillment of a prophecy. This is not a recent question. As we have noted, upholding and defending Jesus' omniscience was an important task for the evangelist in John 13:18. Hays explains that the answer for this moral dilemma question needs to be found in the NT authors' larger contextual understanding of Scripture that connects the two events together. Oftentimes, those moral dilemmas can be adequately explained within the understanding of the NT authors' understanding and use of OT texts. This particular situation is similarly depicted in the quotation of Jer. 31:15-17 in Matt. 2:17-18. See Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 114-6 for a detailed analysis.

woman. In other words, the heel mentioned in John 13:18 belongs to Judas and the heel mentioned in Gen 3:15 belongs to the seed of the woman. In addition, even at a thematic level, the establishment of the connection between the two texts requires that the evangelist understood the theme of betrayal ultimately in the larger theme of evil. While conceptually it is sensible to understand betrayal in the category of evil, it does require an extra step to confirm that the evangelist did understand betrayal this way or that he did indeed read Psalm 41:10 in light of Gen 3:15. So, did the evangelist have Gen 3:15 in mind when quoting from Psalm 41:10? There are several textual and thematic clues that point to a loose connection. Here, it is helpful to mention Hays' explanation of the category, echo: "it may involve the inclusion of only a word or phrase that evokes, for the alert reader, a reminiscence of an earlier text. Readers who hear the echo will discern some semantic nuance that carries a surplus of significance beyond the literal sense of the text in which the echo occurs."²¹⁵ While it is not likely that Gen 3:15 is to be directly operative in understanding John 13:18 or even Psalm 41:10 in its own OT context, the various plausible connections mentioned above may suggest a loose association or a faint echo.²¹⁶

²¹⁵ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 10

²¹⁶ See *ibid*: "Ordinarily, however, the surface meaning of the text would be intelligible to readers who fail to hear the echoed language."

SUMMARY

The literary unity of the footwashing narrative (John 13:1-20) can be maintained because a) the two seemingly different interpretations of footwashing are indeed complementary, b) this complementary nature is affirmed in the Synoptic Gospels, and c) the language found throughout the narrative is very much characteristic of the evangelist. From this, it is safe to conclude that the evangelist is responsible for the quotation of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18. While there are various theories on why and how the quotation is textually represented the way it is in John 13:18, Menken brings forth the value of assessing the nature of intentionality in the evangelist's editorial activity when quoting Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18. Much of this can be seen through the evangelist's use of interpretive techniques that were commonly known in early Judaism. In addition, the nature of these interpretive techniques must be evaluated along with the evangelist's hermeneutical and theological use of the quotation. When applying this holistic approach for evaluating the textual uniqueness of the quotation in John 13:18, several points can be made. The evangelist a) makes lexical and thematic connections to the bread of life discourse in John 6 (τρώγων instead of LXX's ἐσθίω; ἄρτον instead of LXX's ἄρτους), b) utilizes his own stylistic preference (placing the genitive, μου, before the associated noun, ἄρτον), c) incorporates a common Jewish interpretive technique, *gezerah shawa* (לגדיל as ἐπῆρεν as opposed to LXX's ἐμεγάλυνεν), d) makes textual decisions based on the OT background text (the presence of αὐτοῦ when absent in the LXX), and e) secures a theological emphasis on Jesus' omniscience (πτέρναν

instead of LXX's *πτερνισμόν*; absence of the opening phrase of Psalm 41:10). Perhaps the most important theological implication from this entire analysis is seen in the way that Jesus is portrayed as the ultimate David and Judas as the ultimate Ahithophel. In this way, by quoting from this particular psalm, Jesus as the righteous sufferer appropriates the pain of David onto his own experience of betrayal. Jesus is not only seeing the predictive nature of Psalm 41:10 but also, and more importantly, a typological one that allows him to fulfill the story of David in himself. This typological connection is also noticed in Judas and Ahithophel especially when the details and descriptions of their lives mentioned in the OT and the NT are considered. Their associations with Jesus and David, respectively, heighten this typological connection. Zooming out even more from this specific context and looking at the larger biblical narrative, one can argue that this particular tension situated in John 13:18 is a reflection of the larger biblical tension between the line of promise and the line of evil that originated from Gen 3:15.

CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION

4.1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Through this study, I explored how the evangelist interpreted and used Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18 to portray Jesus as the righteous sufferer who embodies the culmination of Davidic suffering. The very need for this study comes from the understanding that the evangelist was not loosely handling his OT references but instead he allowed them to influence his narrative and theology greatly. Hanson states the following: “Scripture in the Fourth Gospel at least acts as a control upon John. He allows it to influence his narrative; he relies on it to provide him with much of his Christology. It is not merely his servant. At times it seems to be his mentor.”²¹⁷ This particular understanding of the evangelist’s use of the OT fundamentally shaped the way I approached the direction of this study. I argued that the question of how the evangelist understood and used the quotation, which emphasizes the hermeneutics of the evangelist and the use of certain interpretive techniques to arrive at his particular textual decision, is just as important as the questions of what the quotation means and why it is used the way it is used.

Psalm 41:10 in its own context was discussed in chapter 2. Psalm 41 is broken down into three sections and the verse of our interest, verse 10, marks the climax of the second section (vv. 5-11), where the psalmist expresses his lament in full. Verses

²¹⁷ Hanson, *Prophetic Gospel*, 251. This has much to do with Hays’ understanding of figural interpretation. See Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 14: “It is particularly important to see that the sort of figural interpretation practiced by the canonical Evangelists is not a rejection but a retrospective hermeneutical transformation of Israel’s sacred texts. Figural readings do not annihilate the earlier pole of the figural correspondence; to the contrary, they affirm its reality and find in it a significance beyond that which anyone could previously have grasped.”

5-11 describe the pain of the psalmist step by step. The psalmist feels the weight of the verbal and emotional attacks by his enemies (vv.6-9) and his experience of betrayal from his intimate friend (v.10) affects him greatly. The psalmist describes this intimate friend as a man of his peace, someone he can trust, and someone he can give his bread to. Meal sharing often signifies strong bonds in the ancient Near East.²¹⁸ In a way, the element of intimacy is highlighted up front so that the agony of betrayal is magnified even more. Scholarly consensus is that the idiomatic phrase in verse 10, “has made his heel great against me”, is used to describe the psalmist’s experience of betrayal by his intimate friend. The exact translation value is disputed but the nuance and meaning of betrayal are clearly communicated through this phrase.

After establishing the communicated meaning of Psalm 41:10 in its own context, the study explored the hermeneutical and interpretive norms of this passage during early and late Judaism. This approach allows one to understand how the psalm was received, understood, and interpreted by the various Jewish communities before, during, and after the days of Jesus. This approach functions as a contextual clue to the way the evangelist understood the psalm. The following are some of the noteworthy implications based on the observations made from 1 QH^a 13.25-26, m. Abot 6.3, b. Sanh 106b, and Tg. Ps 55: a) the language of Psalm 41:10 is used to describe one’s experience of pain and betrayal in different contexts, b) the author of the psalm is assumed to be David, and c) the historical backdrop for Psalm 41:10 and

²¹⁸ Dahood, *Psalms I*, 1-50, 251.

Psalm 55:14 is commonly understood to be the story of David and Ahithophel. The Davidic association with Psalm 41:10 found in these texts provides the necessary context for understanding the interpretive, theological, and textual decisions that the evangelist makes when quoting Psalm 41:10 in the Fourth Gospel.

In chapter 3, John 13:18 in its own context was given the spotlight. While there are scholars who suggest that the evangelist is not responsible for this quotation, the strong literary unity of John 13:1-21, which includes our verse of interest, seems to suggest otherwise. The evidence suggests that the evangelist is the author of the entire footwashing narrative and this implies that the evangelist is the one responsible for quoting Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18. After establishing who is responsible for the text, the question of how the evangelist quoted Psalm 41:10 was thoroughly explored. A simple comparison chart of how Psalm 41:10 is textually presented in the MT, LXX, and Fourth Gospel provides the very problem and the need for this study. The way the Fourth Gospel quotes Psalm 41:10 is not commonly shared with any known sources, including the LXX. In fact, the LXX and the Fourth Gospel are noticeably different in the ways they translate or quote Psalm 41:10. It was suggested that the evangelist is responsible for the textual uniqueness represented in the Fourth Gospel and that he may have translated directly from the Hebrew while incorporating various interpretive techniques that reflect the evangelist's stylistic preferences and his theological motives. One main example of this is seen in the way that the evangelist employs his preferred word of style, *τρώγω*, instead of the LXX's *ἐσθίω*. Because John 6 is the only other place in the Fourth

Gospel where the word *τρώγω* appears, it is likely that the evangelist is using this particular word to stay consistent in his word choice and also to theologically tie in the relationship between eating and believing. Another example is seen in the way that the evangelist utilizes a common Jewish interpretive technique, *gezerah shawa*, to ultimately highlight the theological connection between the betrayal of Judas and the betrayal of Ahithophel. This textually based theological connection leads to an understanding of the evangelist's way of displaying Jesus as the righteous sufferer, the one who takes on the suffering of David. This quotation then functions as another piece to the puzzle for seeing Jesus' own understanding of himself as the second, ultimate David. In Jesus' experience of Judas' betrayal, not only does he see the appropriation, but also the culmination of the Davidic suffering. All of this points to the reality that Scripture must be fulfilled, demonstrating that this betrayal is not an unforeseen occasion but a fulfillment of the story of the Messiah, the righteous sufferer. To zoom out even further, it is also possible to see the role that John 13:18 plays in the larger biblical understanding of evil and good. For this reason, the role of Gen 3:15 in the quotation of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18 was discussed. Based on Hays' definition, Gen 3:15 may be understood as an echo. While it seems unnatural to attribute a significant role for Gen 3:15 in the mind of the evangelist when quoting Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18, it cannot be denied that the suffering that Jesus endures is indeed in accordance with the larger biblical theme of evil and good. Thematically, the ironic ending of the ultimate good overcoming the

ultimate evil in what seems to be a defeat is also depicted and hinted in both passages.

John 13:18 demonstrates that the evangelist understood Psalm 41:10 as an account of Davidic suffering. The Davidic association then necessarily shaped the evangelist's textual, hermeneutical, and theological decisions to highlight Jesus as the righteous sufferer, the Messiah, who completes the story of David. Jesus is the ultimate David who was betrayed by an intimate friend and was eventually led to his death on the cross. It was through this death that he defeated evil on its head. As he was raised up and vindicated by God in his resurrection, Jesus also displayed the fulfillment of the confidence that David had in his rescue (Psalm 44:11)

4.2 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

There are several ways that the content of this study can lead to other ideas of research. The following suggestions help further explore the biblical theological implications from this study.

The first suggestion is to further explore the theme of Davidic suffering in the Fourth Gospel and the NT at large. The specific case of betrayal was explored in this study through the evaluation of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18. As Glasson says, "the Son of David repeats the sad journey of his ancestor."²¹⁹ The quotation of Psalm 22 in Matthew 27:46 and Mark 15:34 is often understood to be the most notable portrayal of Jesus' suffering in light of David's suffering. In what ways, in the Fourth

²¹⁹ Glasson, "Davidic Links", 118.

Gospel and other places in the NT, does Davidic suffering play a role in the understanding of Jesus as the Messiah? How much awareness was there in early Judaism about the role of suffering for the Messiah? Building on this, a comparative study on Davidic suffering and Isaianic suffering can be helpful and beneficial as well. How do they differ? How are they similar?

Secondly, a more detailed analysis on the possible relationship between John 13:18 and Gen 3:15 can prove to be helpful as well. While this topic was lightly mentioned in this study, a much more comprehensive analysis on this topic can be a study on its own. This would require an assessment of the role of Gen 3:15 in other OT and Second Temple Jewish texts. This would then allow a richer contextual and theological understanding of Gen 3:15 that is helpful for better analyzing the possible relationship between John 13:18 and Gen 3:15. Even beyond the assessment of these two particular verses, the analysis may be fruitful and beneficial for better understanding the theological impact and influence of Gen 3:15 in the minds of other NT authors.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, David M. "Introduction: The Study of the Use of the Old Testament in the New." *JSNT* 38 (2015): 3-16.
- Anderson, A. A. *2 Samuel*. Word Biblical Commentary 11. Dallas: Nelson, 1989.
- Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis: the Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- Baker, David L. *Two Testaments, One Bible: the Theological Relationship between the Old and the New Testaments*. 3rd ed. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2010.
- Ball, David Mark. *"I Am" in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background, and Theological Implications*. JSNTS 124. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.
- Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel According to St. John: an Introduction with Commentary and Notes On the Greek Text*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1978.
- Bauckham, Richard. *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2015.
- _____. *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies On the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- _____. *The Jewish World Around the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2010.
- _____. *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.
- Bauer, Walter, Frederick W. Danker, William F. Arndt, and Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Beale, G. K. *Handbook On the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012.
- Beale, G. K., ed. *The Right Doctrine From the Wrong Text? Essays On the Use of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.

- Beasley-Murray, George R. *John*. 2nd ed. Word Biblical Commentary 36. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1999.
- Berding, Kenneth, and Jonathan Lunde, eds. *Three Views On the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008.
- Bishop, E. F. "He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me – John xiii.18 (Ps. XI.9)." *ET* 70 (1958-59): 331-33.
- Blomberg, Craig L. *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel: Issues and Commentary*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011.
- Borgen, Peter. *Bread from Heaven: an Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo*. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Botterweck, Johannes G., and Helmer Ringgren, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated by John T. Willis et al. 8 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–2006.
- Brant, Jo-Ann A. *John*. Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011.
- Briggs, Charles A. and Emilie Grace Briggs. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*. The International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1906.
- Brooke, George J. "The Psalms in Early Jewish Literature in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 5-23 in *The Psalms in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken; London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel According to John*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible. Garden City: Doubleday, 1971-90.
- _____. *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave*. London: Chapman, 1994.
- _____. *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*. New York: Paulist, 1979.
- Brueggemann, Walter and William H. Bellinger Jr. *Psalms*. New Cambridge Bible Commentary. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: a Commentary*. Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray et al. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1971 (1941).

- Callaway, Phillip R. "The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation." *JSPSup* 3 (1988): 185-97.
- Carson, D. A., and G. K. Beale, eds. *Commentary On the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Nottingham: Baker, 2007.
- Carson, D. A. *The Gospel According to John*. Leicester: Eerdmans, 1991.
- _____. *Matthew*. Expositor's Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983-85.
- Clifford, Richard J. *Psalms 1-72*. Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 2002.
- Coloe, Mary L. "Welcome into the Household of God: the footwashing in John 13." *CBQ* 66 (2004): 400-415.
- Craigie, Peter C. *Psalms 1-50*. Word Biblical Commentary 19. Waco: Word, 1983.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- _____. "The Johannine *hypodeigma*: A Reading of John 13." *Semeia* 53 (1991): 133-52.
- Dahood, Mitchell. *Psalms 1-50*. Anchor Bible. Garden City: Doubleday, 1966.
- Daly-Denton, Margaret. *David in the Fourth Gospel: the Johannine Reception of the Psalms*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- deClaisse-Walford, Nancy L., Rolf A. Jacobson, and Beth LaNeel Tanner. *The Book of Psalms*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
- de Waard, J. *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Dodd, C. H. *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1976.
- Dunn, James D. G. "The Washing of the Disciples' Feet in John 13:1-20." *ZNW* 61 (1970): 247-52.

- Epstein, I., ed. *The Babylonian Talmud*. 34 vols. London: Soncino Press, 1935–1948.
- Evans, C. A. *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005.
- Dupont-Sommer, Andre. *Le Livre des Hymnes découvertes près de la mer Morte (1QH)*. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1957.
- Faure, Alexander. "Die alttestamentlichen Zitate im 4. Evangelium und die Quellenscheidungshypothese." *ZNW* 21 (1922): 99-121.
- Foster, Paul. "Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament." *JSNT* 38 (2015): 97-109.
- Freed, Edwin D. *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John*. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Glasson, T.F. *Moses in the Fourth Gospel*. London: SCM Press, 1963.
- _____. "Davidic Links with the Betrayal of Jesus." *ExpTim* 85 (1973-74): 118-19.
- Goppelt, Leonhard. *Typos: the Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *Psalms: a Form-Critical Introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.
- Hanson, Anthony Tyrrell. *The Prophetic Gospel: a Study of John and the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
- Harris, R. Laird, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke, eds. *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Chicago: Moody, 1980.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2016.
- _____. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Holm-Nielson, *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*. Acta Theologica Danica 2. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960.

- Hugenberger, G. P. "Introductory Notes on Typology." Pages 331-341 in *The Right Doctrine From the Wrong Text? Essays On the Use of the Old Testament in the New*. Edited by G. K. Beale; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994).
- Jeremias, Gert. *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*. Edited by Karl Georg Kuhn. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.
- Kaiser, Walter. "Single Meaning, Unified Referents." Pages 45-90 in *Three Views on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by K. Berding and J. Lunde; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008.
- Kautzsch, E., ed. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Translated by A. E. Cowley. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1980.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John*. 2 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003. Repr. Peabody: Baker, 2010.
- Keil, C. F. and Franz Delitzsch. *Commentary On the Old Testament - Psalms*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969 (1861).
- Kim, Dongsu. *An Exegesis of Apostasy Embedded in John's Narratives of Peter and Judas Against the Synoptic Parallels*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 2004.
- Kirkpatrick, A. F. *Psalms I-XLI*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1901.
- Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1976.
- Kittel, Rudolf, Karl Elliger, Wilhelm Rudolph, Hans Peter Rüger, and G. E. Weil, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. 5th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.
- Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann Jakob Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. 5 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994-2000.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J. *John*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004.

- _____. "John." Pages 415-512 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Nottingham: Baker, 2007.
- _____. "Jesus the Good Shepherd Who Will Also Bring Other Sheep (John 10:16): The Old Testament Background of a Familiar Metaphor." *BBR* 12.1 (2002): 67-96.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Psalms 1-59: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Lincoln, Andrew. *The Gospel According to Saint John*. Black's New Testament Commentary. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2013.
- Lindars, Barnabas. "The Place of the Old Testament in the Formation of New Testament Theology: Prolegomena." *NTS* 23 (1976-7): 59-66.
- _____. *New Testament Apologetic: the Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*. London: SCM-Canterbury, 1973.
- _____. *The Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Longman, Tremper. *Psalms*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2014.
- Longman, Tremper, and Raymond B. Dillard. *An Introduction to the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006.
- Malina, Bruce J., and Richard L. Rohrbaugh. *Social-Science Commentary On the Gospel of John*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998.
- Martin, Francis, and William M. IV Wright. *The Gospel of John*. Catholic Commentary On Sacred Scripture. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2015.
- Martínez, Florentino García and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- McNamara, Martin, et al., ed. *The Aramaic Bible*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1987-.

- Menken, Maarten J. J. *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*. Kampen: Peeters, 1996.
- _____. "The Translation of Psalm 41.10 in John 13.18." *JSNT* 40 (1990): 61-79.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey. *The Gospel of John*. The New International Commentary On the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- _____. "The Uses of Scripture in John 13:18-19," in *The Gospels and the Scripture of Israel*. Edited by Craig Evans and Richard Stegner. Michigan: Sheffield Academic, 1994.
- Moloney, Francis J. "The Gospel of John: The 'End' of Scripture." *INT* 63 (2009): 357-366.
- _____. *The Gospel of John: Text and Context*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- _____. "A Sacramental Reading of John 13:1-38." *CBQ* 53 (1991): 237-56.
- Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to John*. The New International Commentary On the New Testament. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Moyise, Steve. *Jesus and Scripture: Studying the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011.
- Moyise, Steve, and Maarten J.J. Menken, eds. *The Psalms in the New Testament*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Myers, Alicia D. *Characterizing Jesus: A Rhetorical Analysis On the Fourth Gospel's Use of Scripture in Its Presentation of Jesus*. LNTS 458. London: T&T Clark, 2014.
- Myers, Alicia D. and Bruce G. Schuchard. *Abiding Words: the Use of Scripture in the Gospel of John*. Resources for Biblical Study. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Nestle, Eberhard, Erwin Nestle, Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, and Holger Strutwolf, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2013.
- Newsom, Carol A. "Kenneth Burke Meets the Teacher of Righteousness: Rhetorical Strategies in the Hodayot and the Serek Hayahd." Pages 121-30 in *Of*

Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins. Edited by Harold W. Attridge, John J. Collins, and Thomas H. Tobin. Lanham: University Press of America, 1990.

Painter, John. "The Farewell Discourses and the History of Johannine Christianity." *NTS* 27 (1981): 525-43.

Pietersma, Albert. "David in the Greek Psalms." *VT* 30 (1980): 213-226.

Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Rahlfs, Alfred, and Robert Hanhart, eds. *Septuaginta id est Vestus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.

Reim, Günter. *Studien Zum Alttestamentlichen Hintergrund Des Johannesevangeliums*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

Robinson, J. A. T. "The Significance of Footwashing." Pages 144-147 in *Neotestamentica et Patristica*. Edited by O. Cullmann; Leiden: Brill, 1962.

Ross, Allen P. *A Commentary On The Psalms: 1-41*. Kregal Exegetical Library. Grand Rapids: Kregal Academic & Professional, 2012.

Rowley, H. H. *Worship in Ancient Israel: Its Forms and Meaning*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1969.

Sabbe, Maurits. "The Footwashing in Jn 13 and Its Relation to the Synoptic Gospels." *ETL* 58 (1982): 31-51.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel According to St. John*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Crossroad, 1990.

Schuchard, Bruce G. *Scripture Within Scripture: the Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Sheridan, Ruth. *Retelling Scripture*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Thomas, John Christopher. *Footwashing in John 13 and the Johannine Community*. JSNTS 61. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991.

Thompson, Marianne Meye. *John*. New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2015.

Toy, C. H. *Quotations in the New Testament*. New York: Scribner's, 1884.

Wahlde, Urban C. von. *The Gospel and Letters of John*. 3 vols. The Eerdmans Critical Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Waltke, Bruce K. and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Westcott, Brooke Foss. *The Gospel According to St. John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978 (1882).

Wilcox, M. "The Composition of John 13:21-30." Pages 145-46 in *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*. Edited by E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox; Edinburg: T&T Clark, 1969.

Witherington, Ben. *John's Wisdom: a Commentary On the Fourth Gospel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995.

York, Anthony D. "The Dating of Targumic Literature." *JSJ* 5 (1974): 49-62.

Zola, Nicholas J. "The One Who Eats My Bread Has Lifted His Heel against Me: Psalm 41:10 in 1 QH^a 13.25-26 and John 13:18." *PRS* 37 (2010): 407-419.

VITA

Benjamin Bae was born on October 22, 1988 in Seoul, Korea. He and his family moved to California when he was 11 years old. He graduated from University of Southern California in 2011 with a Bachelor of Arts in Sociology. Upon graduating, he decided to pursue his theological education at Gordon Conwell Theological Seminary in preparation for pastoral ministry. In 2014, he completed his Master of Divinity degree. In May 2017, he will also complete his Master of Theology degree in New Testament. He is currently on staff at Citylife Presbyterian Church and is pursuing his ordination in the Presbyterian Church in America. He resides in Newton, Massachusetts with his wife, Jeanie.